

3
107

DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLIII, No. 1107

September 12, 1960

AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS CONDEMN SINO-SOVIET INTERVENTION IN AMERICAN STATES • *Statements by Secretary Herter and Text of Declaration of San José* 395

U.S. SUBMITS SUPPLEMENT TO DOCUMENT ON CUBA TO OAS MINISTERIAL MEETING 409

PRESIDENT URGES CONGRESS TO RESTORE MUTUAL SECURITY FUND CUTS 417

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO SIGN NEW AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT (Text) 423

CALIFORNIA
STATE LIBRARY

SEP 22 1960

DOCUMENTS SECTION X

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLIII, No. 1107 • PUBLICATION 7065

September 12, 1960

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
\$2 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

American Foreign Ministers Condemn Sino-Soviet Intervention in American States

Following are three statements made by Secretary Herter at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of the American Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica, together with the text of a declaration adopted by the ministers on August 28 and statements made by the Secretary upon his departure from San José and his return to Washington.

STATEMENT OF AUGUST 24

Press release 486 dated August 24, as delivered

For the seventh time the foreign ministers of the American Republics meet to consider safeguards for the hemisphere. As was clearly indicated in the call issued by the Government of Peru requesting this meeting,¹ a major concern affecting relations among the American states has been the threat of extracontinental intervention in hemisphere affairs. What was feared only as a possibility when we met a year ago in Santiago, Chile,² has now become a stark reality. The leaders of the Soviet Union and Communist China have made abundantly clear their determination to exploit the situation in Cuba as a means of intervening in inter-American affairs. Their purpose is to break the bonds of inter-American solidarity, sow distrust and fear among the people of the American hemisphere, and thereby prepare the way for political control of the New World.

The United States Government believes that the Organization of American States is the proper forum to discuss this issue. Our organization has again and again demonstrated its capacity to confront and resolve the threats to peace in the Western Hemisphere. The Government of Cuba has repeatedly stated that the Organization of American States is not the proper forum. It bypassed our organization by filing a petition with the

United Nations. The United Nations Security Council indicated that the matter should properly be considered by the Organization of American States.³ Nevertheless the President of Cuba [Osvaldo Dorticós] stated on August 9, according to the text of a message attributed to him by the Government organ *Revolución* August 11, as follows:

It is not important to us, and we wish to make this clear now, what the formal results of the Foreign Ministers meeting may be. What matters to us is that we will convert the conference into the revolutionary tribunal of America.

On an earlier occasion the Minister of Revolutionary Armed Forces, Raúl Castro, speaking in Habana, was quoted as having stated on television (August 5, 1960) that

We convened an OAS meeting . . . the other day in the CTC (Cuban labor federation). Representatives from all Latin America were there. We convened the revolutionary OAS at the headquarters of the revolutionary CTC.

Earlier this year, on March 28, Dr. Fidel Castro said:

. . . and then they threaten to incite the Latin American countries against us with this pact of Rio de Janeiro, by which we do not feel obligated because the revolution did not sign this pact. That is to say, and it is well that we do not feel, and we declare it categorically, that we do not feel obligated by this pact of Rio de Janeiro.

I should like to call the attention of the Ministers here to the press statements made by Fidel Castro last night which it would be well for all of us to read and ponder.

I ask the Foreign Minister of Cuba whether this statement represents a repudiation of all the agreements signed by the Government of Cuba. I also ask the Foreign Minister of Cuba to inform this meeting later on whether he does or does not regard the Organization of American States as

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1960, p. 225.

² *Ibid.*, Sept. 7, 1959, p. 342.

³ *Ibid.*, Aug. 8, 1960, p. 199.

the proper body for the consideration of the matters before us. If his answer is in the negative, this meeting has a right to know his reasons and to ask just what are the objectives of his Government in attending this meeting.

Mr. Chairman, our consultative meeting has before it a four-point agenda. I should like to suggest that we discuss this agenda as a whole rather than point by point. The first two points deal with the extracontinental threat to peace in this hemisphere. The last point is related since it deals with peace and stability in the Caribbean. I shall discuss these three points now.

Extracontinental Threat to Inter-American System

Mr. Chairman and distinguished colleagues, an urgent challenge faces the inter-American system today. This is Sino-Soviet imperialism. The American Republics have adopted and sanctified the principle that the Western Hemisphere is not to be regarded as an area for military or political intervention by any power external to this hemisphere or for the establishment of colonies, protectorates, or other instrumentalities of such intervention. This collective principle is a main pillar of the Organization of American States. It has been given clear expression in the Rio Treaty. In earlier times the danger was simple. It was clearly recognizable. Intervention by an external power in the affairs of the Americas meant the use or threat of armed force on a national basis.

Since the rise of totalitarian states in the modern world, however, there has been added a new type of danger. Even more real, it is also more devious. This is the danger of the exercise of power by agencies owing allegiance to a foreign, non-American power and expressed through indigenous personnel using indigenous language, but nonetheless agencies controlled from without. This was true with regard to the Fascist powers in the period immediately preceding and during World War II. It now presents itself under the guise of communism.

We should, therefore, examine briefly whether or not the institution in the Western Hemisphere of a Communist regime in any one of the American Republics constitutes in effect foreign intervention. I believe the history of the last 43 years gives only one answer. This is that a Communist government is in effect the agency of a foreign

power. It owes its primary allegiance not to the people of the country in which it operates but to a foreign power or powers.

This unchallengeable fact can be demonstrated exhaustively in the history of the Communist movement since seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in 1917. Almost from the very moment of its establishment by Lenin in 1919, the Communist International, or Comintern, as it was called, operated as an instrument of the policies of the Soviet Union. This became progressively more evident until under the personal dictatorship of Stalin it was specifically stated that the first duty of any of its parties abroad and its members under party discipline was to support and defend the policies of the Soviet Union above any other form of allegiance. Whatever the changes since Stalin's death, there have been none in this field.

The postwar history of Eastern Europe, where these Communist parties were installed in power with the help of the Soviet armed forces, has demonstrated to the satisfaction of any reasonable person that once a Communist regime is installed that country loses its political personality and its freedom of action in democracy. Above all, the foreign policies of that country parallel with uncanny natural accuracy those of the Soviet Union.

In the history of the Communist movement there is only one successful important departure from this pattern, and this departure in itself constitutes perhaps the greatest proof of the validity of the statement I have just made. In order to escape from the domination of Moscow, the Republic of Yugoslavia was forced in an open and spectacular manner to break with Moscow. The fact that such open defiance was necessary and the savagery with which this defection was greeted by Moscow is among the most convincing proofs that the domination by Moscow of Communist parties and regimes is fact and not fiction.

If further proof were needed it can be found in the tragic and unsuccessful attempt by the Hungarian people to free themselves from Moscow's dominance. In this instance the attempt was not successful, primarily owing to the presence of Soviet forces in Hungary. The gallant attempt of the Hungarian people to recapture their freedom was drowned in blood by Soviet armed divisions.

I think we can accept as a fact, in light of the historical record, that any Communist regime es-

not to the established in any one of the American Republics would in effect constitute foreign intervention in the Americas as defined in our numerous agreements and treaties. It would therefore be a matter of the gravest concern to all the states of the Americas.

As developments in Eastern Europe demonstrated, the installation of a Communist regime in any American Republic could automatically involve the loss of that country's independence in foreign relations and to a large degree in its domestic affairs. Additionally any such regime would automatically by its very nature become an operational base for the propagation of Communist ideas, for infiltration, subversion, and interference in the internal affairs of all the Americas, designed in the last analysis to overthrow by force every government in this hemisphere.

I think we can accept as an established fact that our inter-American association is firmly based on the foundation of resistance to intervention in our affairs by any foreign power. We can also accept as fact that a Communist regime, once installed, would be an obedient and servile agency of a foreign power or powers and therefore in truth constitutes foreign intervention no less than does overt armed intervention. It is obvious that foreign-directed communism is 20th-century imperialism.

Evidence of Communist Control in Cuba

We should now consider on the basis of available evidence whether the present regime of Cuba has submitted to the control of the Communist powers or to what degree it has moved in that direction. We can only note that the emergence of a pattern in the Cuban Government and the direction in which it is heading, based in no small measure on the statements of its own leaders, are sufficient to cause the gravest concern to all members of the American community.

In the first place, the Communist Party of Cuba, operating under another name, is the only political party permitted any activity in Cuba.

Secondly, thanks to this encouragement and support of the present Cuban leadership, the Communist Party, following the classic pattern established by Lenin and perfected by his successors, seems to be infiltrating and establishing even more control over such organizations as the trade union movements, farmers associations, people's

militia, and indeed every form of social and political association in Cuba.

Thirdly, we have heard from the mouths of Cuban Government leaders the repeated statements that anticommunism is the equivalent of counterrevolution.

The application of the label "counterrevolutionary" to any group or individual who differs in the slightest degree from the regime is a standard Communist technique. It has been used throughout Soviet history as a pretext for the use of terror as an instrument of government. It has been indiscriminately applied to any political or active opponent of the regime, including, I might add, men who actively directed the 1917 coup d'etat in Russia.

We should, I think, take very careful note of this fact of identifying anticommunism in any form with counterrevolution. The present regime in Cuba is following faithfully the Bolshevik pattern in providing for itself a pretext under which any opponent of whatever political coloration may be dealt with as a counterrevolutionary and hence as the object of any illegal method, arrest, or execution which the regime, unfettered by law, may find most expedient to apply. This doctrine of the Cuban Government, that anticommunism means counterrevolution, is also, of course, a terrible blow to democracy in Cuba. It means that the Communist Party is the only one to be supported, the only one against which not a word can be uttered with impunity.

Fourthly, I am sure we have all noted the increasing tendency of the Cuban regime to support the Soviet Union and Chinese Communists in the field of foreign affairs. I have yet to see in recent months the slightest criticism from any official Cuban source of any Soviet or Chinese action or attitude. This is another manifestation of a developing pattern in the Cuban revolution which is a legitimate matter of concern to us all.

Fifthly, Cuban soil is being used for the export of Soviet communism to other American Republics. The extent of this effort is known to all of us. Some elements of it have been experienced by virtually every other American Republic. Note has been taken, for example, of the statement by Fidel Castro at a rally on July 26, 1960, as follows:

Let us promise, let us promise to those who gave their lives to create a new life for the fatherland, that we will continue to make efforts so that our fatherland will

daily be a better example. And here, before the undefeated mountain range, let us promise ourselves to continue making our fatherland the example which will make the Andes Mountains the Sierra Maestra of the American Continent.

Sixthly, we all have noted, I believe with sorrow, the enthusiastic welcome given by the Cuban Government to statements by Soviet rulers that they are ready to support Cuba with rocket fire against the United States.⁴ Whether or not the Soviet rocket threat against this hemisphere is real or a characteristic bluff is immaterial to the point we are discussing. What is important, however, is the enthusiastic welcome which it has received in Cuba.

These trends and the general pattern we see developing in Cuba would indicate to any reasonable person that it is in the Communist direction that the present Cuban leadership, in contravention of the original expressions of the revolution, is leading the country. It is not clear from the statements made at our previous meetings last week⁵ by the Cuban Foreign Minister and from statements of his superiors in Habana whether the present Cuban Government regards communism and its installations in the American states as a form of controlled foreign intervention in the affairs of American states and hence a threat to our peace and security as defined in inter-American treaties. I think this meeting is entitled to a clear answer from the Cuban representative on this point.

Conflict With Declaration of Santiago

As the process of Soviet intervention moves forward into every phase of the national life of a country, it naturally conflicts with the basic political objectives which the American peoples have set for themselves, namely, the establishment of representative democracy. It is essential to the purposes of Moscow and Peiping that the basis of political democracy be destroyed.

The American concept of democracy insists upon a belief in the dignity of man and a recognition of fundamental human rights and freedoms. These ideas are in direct conflict with the authoritarian concepts of the Communist powers, in whose eyes all morality and political belief are but instruments of the party and the state. Appro-

priating the slogans, symbols, and terms of political democracy, the Communist forces use them to destroy the very basis of democracy as well as its institutions. This, too, has been a major feature in the increasing influence of the Sino-Soviet bloc and their associated instrumentalities in Cuba.

The objectives of the Cuban people in overthrowing the dictatorship that had existed in their island, and in setting up a new government with a revolutionary program, were received with widespread sympathy and support throughout the American states. We heard with deep satisfaction the promises of Dr. Castro to restore individual and political rights and to introduce other political reforms that would assure to the Cuban people the benefits of true democracy under constitutional guarantees. It has therefore been a cause of deep disappointment to see the original purposes of the Cuban revolution distorted and perverted to fit the pattern of totalitarian Communist development.

Of particular significance to this meeting of foreign ministers is the record of how the leaders of the Castro government, bending to the influence of extracontinental forces, have increasingly departed from the principles of representative democracy and respect for human rights.

Mr. Chairman, 1 year ago almost to the day the foreign ministers of the American Republics adopted in Santiago, Chile, the historic document known as the Declaration of Santiago.⁶ I should like now to turn to the application in Cuba of the vital principles contained in that declaration, which, I might add, was subscribed to without qualification by the Foreign Minister of Cuba, who is participating here in our deliberations.

The Declaration of Santiago sets forth seven principles. The first principle is that the rule of law be assured by the separation of powers and by the control of the legality of governmental acts by competent organs of the state. But today, 1 year later, there is no separation of powers in Cuba. The present government of Cuba, by the fundamental law of February 7, 1959, vests the executive power in the President of the Republic, assisted by the Council of Ministers, which Council also possesses the legislative power. The once independent judiciary of Cuba has been subjected to executive pressures and in large part superseded by revolutionary tribunals.

⁴ For background, see *ibid.*, July 25, 1960, p. 139.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1960, p. 355.

⁶ For text, see *ibid.*, Sept. 7, 1959, p. 342.

The second principle of the Declaration of Santiago is that the Governments of the American Republics should be the result of free elections. In Cuba free elections were a stated aim of the revolutionary movement and were an early promise by the Castro government. But today, 1 year later, in its 20th month in office, the Castro regime has not given elections to the Cuban people nor even indicated when, if ever, it plans to hold elections.

The third principle of the Declaration of Santiago is that perpetuation in power, or the exercise of power without a fixed term and with the manifest intent of perpetuation, is incompatible with the effective exercise of democracy. But today, 1 year later, the determination of the Castro government to hold on to power indefinitely is proven by its refusal to hold, or even prepare to hold, elections. The fact is that Dr. Fidel Castro has named his brother Raúl to succeed him—hardly a democratic method of election.

The fourth principle of the Declaration of Santiago is that the governments of the American states should maintain a system of freedom for the individual and of social justice based on respect for fundamental human rights. But today, 1 year later, the present Government of Cuba continually, and obviously as a fixed policy, flouts fundamental human rights. One need but mention its initial mass shootings at the *paredón* and subsequent hasty trials and executions without right of appeal; the increasing numbers of political prisoners; the persecution of disillusioned critics of the Castro regime; the suppression of free labor movements; the destruction of academic freedom and university autonomy.

The fifth principle of the Declaration of Santiago is that human rights incorporated into the legislation of the American states should be protected by effective judicial procedures. But today, 1 year later, the Castro regime has so twisted and altered fundamental law that the right of habeas corpus has been suspended. Citizens actively opposing the regime are in peril of severe penalties, including death sentences from the revolutionary tribunals. Private property is confiscated arbitrarily. Judicial procedure is disdained. Judicial protection for human rights is but a phrase in a law book.

The sixth principle of the Declaration of Santiago is that the systematic use of political pro-

scription is contrary to American democratic order. But today, 1 year later, the Castro government has disfranchised for the next 30 years those persons—about 20,000 in all—who were candidates in elections held under the previous government, even though some of them were opposing the dictator then in power. These same persons have been deprived of the right to hold public office or to receive any retirement benefits or pensions they had earned under previous administrations. Furthermore the former political parties have been eliminated for all practical purposes. Only the Communist Party, known as the Popular Socialist Party, now flourishes in Cuba, though the Communist-controlled remnants of the 26th of July Movement may also be soon recognized as a political party.

The seventh principle of the Declaration of Santiago is that freedom of the press, radio, and television and, in general, freedom of information and expression are essential conditions for the existence of a democratic regime. But today, 1 year later, the Cuban Government exercises absolute control over press, radio, and television. One by one, the Cuban newspapers have been made subservient to the Castro regime. Outstanding editors, some of them among the earliest enthusiasts for the revolution, have fled the country. Radio and television have likewise been subjected to strict government control. Opposition views can no longer be read or heard. This, then, is the record of the perversion of the democratic political purposes of the Cuban revolution. The Inter-American Peace Committee has pointed out in its special report of April 14, 1960, the relationship that exists between international tension, on the one hand, and the violation of human rights and lack of representative democracy, on the other. It is clear that the violations of human rights and the failure to apply the principles of representative democracy in Cuba are likewise contributing to international tensions in the Caribbean.

The suppression of democratic freedoms in Cuba to serve the purposes of an extracontinental power is properly a matter of concern to all the member states of the Organization. This is no purely local and internal affair. The process I have described is part of a determined effort by the Sino-Soviet powers to extend their control over an American state. It is a challenge not

only to one of the basic principles and objectives of the inter-American system but to the very security of our 21 Republics.

Cuban Charges in Security Council

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to mention the subject of the charges brought by the Castro government against the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations. I shall speak on that subject when those charges are presented in our present forum. The United States is entirely agreeable to the consideration of Cuban-United States problems in the context of the Organization of American States and its principles and procedures. We would be happy to utilize any appropriate procedure or organ of the OAS as a means of clarifying facts and thereby facilitating the solution of Cuban-United States problems at such a time as the other member governments of the Organization are convinced that the Cuban Government is ready to play its part in genuinely seeking solutions to these problems.

If Cuba really fears aggression, she can find her best guarantees against it in the Organization of American States. And in this same relationship a Cuba that is a truly independent and loyal member of the American family will find in the United States a readiness to respond with a genuine desire to restore friendship and understanding in keeping with the principles to which all members of the American family of nations have sworn allegiance.

Mr. Chairman, I have now referred to the first, second, and fourth points on our agenda. As to the third point, we shall have a full opportunity to discuss economic problems in depth and I hope with fruitful results when the American Republics meet within 2 weeks in Bogotá.⁷ The United States Government will go to that conference prepared to take its full share in the plans and actions required for the material progress of our neighbors to the south. In the meantime, of course, we shall be glad to listen to the foreign ministers here and to consider with them any observations they wish to make on this agenda and such a declaration as this meeting can appropriately make. Our suggestions in this regard are

⁷ The Special Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States To Study Formulation of New Measures for Economic Development (Committee of 21) opened its third meeting at Bogotá on Sept. 5.

expressed in a draft resolution which we have submitted. I believe we should encounter no difficulty in this matter since our objectives are the same.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished colleagues, I believe that all of us here will agree that this is a critical period for the Organization of American States. The effectiveness with which the Organization meets the grave problems that confront us will test its capacity to serve our future. Last week the Sixth Consultative Meeting of Foreign Ministers acted courageously to meet one threat to peace in this hemisphere. Now it must act with equal courage to meet another threat to peace in the hemisphere, this time greatly magnified by an extracontinental menace.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that this meeting of foreign ministers, in the capital of a country which epitomizes so many of the virtues of the inter-American system, will face the crisis of present events and take the necessary positive decision. We should vigorously condemn Soviet and other Communist intervention in our affairs and clearly indicate our grave concern over Cuba's toleration and encouragement of such intervention. We should call for effective resistance to these efforts of the Sino-Soviet bloc and restate the validity of our regional association and its principles as the guide and instrument for our continued cooperation.

STATEMENT OF AUGUST 25

I am confident that the foreign ministers here assembled will examine today's speech by the Cuban Foreign Minister [Raúl Roa] together with the address by Dr. Castro night before last and reach the right conclusions. The Foreign Minister's speech clarified Cuba's attitude at this conference because: First, it showed clearly the Cuban Government is walking hand in hand with the Sino-Soviet bloc. Second, it strongly indicated that Cuba is willing to assist the Soviet Union in spreading communism in the rest of the hemisphere, in contempt of all the principles of the Organization of American States. Third, it revealed the Cuban Government's cynical definition of democracy, since the Cuban Foreign Minister characterized as democracy the situation now existing in Cuba, where the fundamental human freedoms have been abrogated. It was also a

repudiation of the principles of the Santiago Declaration, signed by the Foreign Minister of Cuba just 1 year ago. Fourth, it exhibited a basic and calculated antagonism to the United States which will render more difficult the constant efforts of my country to restore friendly relations with Cuba.

STATEMENT OF AUGUST 26

Press release 493 dated August 26

At the last meeting of this [General] Committee we heard at some length the views of the Foreign Minister of Cuba. I had hoped that he would address himself in a serious and constructive way to the first two items on the agenda, those concerning the threats of extracontinental intervention and subversive activities directed against American states.

I am sorry that the Foreign Minister did not see fit to make direct and responsive replies to the questions which I asked in my statement to this meeting. One can only adduce from his statements that the Communist Party of Cuba, operating under another name or names, will continue to be the only political party permitted any activity in Cuba. One can only conclude that this party will continue to have a large hand in perfecting its control of Cuban institutions and that the attempt by any Cuban to oppose it will be labeled counterrevolutionary with all that that implies.

Dr. Roa's remarks also clearly indicate that the Castro regime will continue to place reliance on the political and military help of the Sino-Soviet bloc and that it will not submit itself to the principles and disciplines of the inter-American system. Our deep concern with those policies of the Castro regime can only be increased by the contempt which has been expressed here for the principles and institutions of representative democracy and for the commitments which were assumed at Santiago only a year ago. It has been asserted that the Castro regime represents the will of the Cuban people and that there is no need for elections. Never in modern history has there been a dictator who did not claim to represent the will of the people. Hitler did, Mussolini did, and so did Josef Stalin. So, too, the dictators of today. But there never has been and never will be contin-

uous unanimity of opinion in any country. The appearance of conformity is always brought about by force and oppression. Democracy is founded on the recognition of the diversity of the human spirit and makes provision in its political institutions for expressions of this diversity.

The failure by the Castro regime to respect the principles of the Santiago Declaration and its evident intention of perpetuating itself in power until the Cuban people are "mature" is cogent evidence of the influence already exercised in Cuba by the Communist powers. The intervention by the Sino-Soviet bloc, the threat of armed attack by the Sino-Soviet bloc based on a fictitious assertion that there is a present danger of military attack on Cuba, the export of communism from Cuba to other countries in this hemisphere, and the related issue of the lack of representative democracy in Cuba are not, I wish to make entirely clear, bilateral issues between the United States and Cuba. They are issues which concern the entire American family. They are issues which go to the very heart of inter-American solidarity and threaten our peace and security.

The United States has never had any intention and has none now of making any military attack on Cuba. I repeat here the statements made by Ambassador [Henry Cabot] Lodge in the hearings in the Security Council of the United Nations on July 18, 1960:⁸

The . . . Foreign Minister of Cuba has told us that Dr. Castro would like assurance from the United States that the United States has no aggressive purposes against Cuba. Unnecessary though it most certainly seems to me, let me here and now give him this assurance, heaped up and overflowing: The United States has no aggressive purposes against Cuba.

This statement came from the second-ranking Cabinet member of the United States Government. The failure therefore of the Cuban Foreign Minister yesterday even to take cognizance of the statement of the official representative of the United States to the United Nations is a very curious omission. This is especially so since he in person heard the statement by Ambassador Lodge and therefore cannot, in honesty, claim he was unaware of it. What may appear to be a small matter in reality gives us a very clear idea as to what is going on. For its own reasons, having nothing to do with what the United States has or has not done, the present Cuban regime appears to be

⁸ BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1960, p. 199.

determined to destroy its relations with the United States. Can it be that Mr. Roa deliberately avoided reference to the solemn assurance of Ambassador Lodge in order to provide justification for Mr. Khrushchev's threat of military action in this hemisphere?

Distinct from the basic issue I have cited is the matter of the charges which were made against the United States. I shall not dignify the attacks on the United States social and political system by replying to them except to say that 180,000,000 people living and working under the flag of the United States are proud of their traditions of representative democracy and social justice. There was a time when negroes were discriminated against in their right to vote in some parts of the United States. This has been progressively remedied. Today all citizens, male or female, unless they have a criminal record, are entitled to vote. It comes with poor grace for the representative of Cuba to inject this false issue into our discussions when not a single citizen, male, female, black, white, or otherwise, is entitled to vote in Cuba.

In this connection I should like to call attention to the telegram each one of us has received from the very distinguished President of Venezuela, Rómulo Betancourt. In that telegram he made the following statement:

In the view of Venezuela the opportunity ought to be seized in the next Inter-American Conference in Quito to draw up a declaration or specific treaty in which there will be defined and specified that governments will not be allowed to form part of the juridical regional community unless they have been elected by the vote of the people and be of irreproachable political character. At the same time it should be stipulated that those governments must respect the fundamental rights of the individual in his quality as a man and as a citizen, guaranteeing freedom of the press and of information and recognizing the right of minorities to organize themselves into political parties and to function freely. Likewise, they should recognize the effective exercise of democratic unionism, because without that, workers' movements acquire a negative, typically totalitarian character.

My Government wishes to state that the lofty principles reiterated in this message as to the need to encourage and protect democracy against totalitarianism are an excellent expression of our sentiments about the problem of Cuba. As to President Betancourt's specific recommendations for action at the Quito conference, we shall at an appropriate time be glad to consider it as a possi-

ble method of strengthening the democracy of the hemisphere.

The United States has consistently exercised restraint in the face of continuing attacks by the Cuban Government which commenced in January 1959, before any of the acts of alleged aggression against the Castro regime occurred. From January 1959 until the present day the political attacks on the United States Government and the scurrilous attempts to besmirch the character of its leaders have nevertheless been consistent and have increased in savagery.

Many of the factors relating to the charges which have been made by the Castro regime are set forth in the documents, one entitled "Provocative Actions of the Government of Cuba Against the United States Which Have Served To Increase Tensions in the Caribbean Area,"⁹ and the other entitled "Responsibility of the Cuban Government for Increased International Tensions in the Hemisphere,"¹⁰ which have been filed with the Inter-American Peace Committee.

The documents, together with a supplement, contain facts in connection with charges by the United States against the Cuban regime. I will not take the time of my colleagues here to make a tedious refutation of details which have already been made available in writing. However, if my colleagues wish me to do so, I will be glad to read the entire 125 pages in this forum.

I do, however, wish to say a few words about what seem to me to be the most important assertions made by the Foreign Minister of Cuba.

Cuban Charges of Military Aggression

First, there are the charges of aggression of military or quasi-military character, namely, the assertion that the United States Government connived at flights by aircraft which took off from Florida bases and violated the Cuban air space and secondly, charges that United States naval vessels have violated Cuban territorial waters.

What is needed here is a determined effort to uncover the true facts. We would welcome this. We have nothing to hide. I therefore suggest that this meeting consider the constitution of a committee for the purpose of making on-the-ground investigations in the United States and in Cuba of

⁹ For text, see *ibid.*, July 18, 1960, p. 79.

¹⁰ For text, see *ibid.*, Aug. 29, 1960, p. 317.

¹¹ For text, see p. 409.

what actually transpired. A report could be made by this committee of its findings, together with appropriate recommendations. I would hope that this report could include the techniques which have repeatedly been used by Cuban nationals to violate United States neutrality, including those used by Dr. Castro when he was hatching his revolution.

Insofar as control of aircraft in Florida is concerned, the United States has instituted the most rigorous and elaborate system of controls ever adopted by my Government in time of peace with the aim of preventing unauthorized flights in the Caribbean area. With 75,000 private planes to police in the United States and 200 airports in the Florida area alone, this is no easy task. Dr. Castro and other 26th of July adherents while in exile in our country can be the best witnesses to what I say. There are only four flights concerning which the United States authorities have any substantial evidence. We have continually asked the Cuban Government to give us evidence of other flights so that we can investigate them, but no such evidence has been furnished.

I will now specifically examine these four flights. In one of these flights the pilot and co-pilot were agents of Fidel Castro. Castro arranged these flights—in our country we say “rigged” these flights—in order to create false evidence of U.S. aggression. I ask this meeting whether, if Fidel Castro indeed had any real evidence of a substantial nature about the alleged campaign of flights—which has been blown up in importance by the Foreign Minister—I ask him why he has bothered to spend the Cuban people’s money in buying false evidence. In two flights of those four, the pilots managed to escape the elaborate preventative network set up by the United States Government which I have described above. As to these two flights, the United States has officially expressed its regrets to the Cuban Government. The final and fourth flight, in May 1960, is still under investigation by my Government. We have asked the Cuban Government to help us in this investigation, but we have never had either any help or even a comment from them other than propaganda talk. We might understand this treatment of the United States, given the calculated campaign of calumny against us, but it is interesting to recall that the Cuban Gov-

ernment has treated the Inter-American Peace Committee with equal disdain.

Concerning alleged violations of Cuban territorial waters, it is known that a United States submarine was fired upon without warning while 11 miles from the Cuban shore, well beyond the 3-mile limit, which, as far as the Government of the United States knows, is still the width of the marginal area claimed by Cuba. The factfinding committee which I have suggested might be able to obtain from the Cuban authorities information concerning other United States naval vessels thought to have been within Cuban territorial waters. I can assure you that this committee would have the full cooperation of the Government of the United States.

Charge of Alleged Economic Aggression

The second charge relates to an alleged economic aggression in reducing Cuba’s sugar quota. Beginning in January 1960, the Castro regime has instituted a series of measures which discriminate against and injure United States trade with Cuba. These measures include: (A) imposition of import licensing requirements contrary to Cuba’s obligations under the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade]; (B) discrimination against the United States in the administration of Cuban trade policy—import licensing, threats and pressures to induce customers of the United States to divert their orders to other suppliers, and state trading are some of the techniques that have been used; (C) reduction by more than 25 percent of the United States rice quota, one of our most important exports to Cuba, the requirement of a fixed “contribution” for each quintal of rice imported, and severe limitations on dollar exchange made available for rice imports—all of this while the Cuban Government imported duty free at least 16,500,000 pounds of rice from a third country with which a bilateral trade agreement had been concluded; (D) imposition of surcharges on remittances of foreign exchange for payment of certain categories of imports ranging from 30 percent to 100 percent; (E) requirement that all exporters in Cuba as well as all persons receiving foreign exchange for services rendered in Cuba must surrender all foreign exchange receipts to an agency of the Castro regime. As a consequence

there now exists a commercial backlog estimated to be in excess of \$100 million; (F) refusal of rediscount facilities to United States-owned financial institutions with the aim of forcing them to bring in funds from abroad to meet normal business requirements.

These and other measures to reduce United States trade while continuing to benefit from access to the United States market have been successful. On the one hand, Cuban imports from the United States were reduced by value during the first 4 months of 1960 by approximately 50 percent of the total for the same period in 1958 and 75 percent of the total for the same period in 1959.

On the other hand, Cuban exports to the United States in the same 4 months' period in 1960 were only slightly below those for the same months of 1958 and well above Cuban exports in the first 4 months of 1959. The United States does not contend that the trade policies of the Castro regime constitute aggression against the United States or intervention in our internal affairs within the meaning of inter-American agreements. Provided it does not violate its international obligations—in this case principally the GATT and the IMF [International Monetary Fund] agreements—it may change its commercial policies as it wishes. We do find it incongruous, on the one hand, that Cuban exports paid for in dollars which can be used by Cuba to purchase goods anywhere in the world are thought to be a form of economic bondage while, on the other, barter agreements which tie the Cuban economy to the Sino-Soviet bloc and prevent the exercise of choice of origin, cost, and quality of Cuban imports are considered to be economic freedom.

I should like to digress for a moment to say something for the possible interest of those in this room with regard to the agreement between Cuba and the Soviet Union for the sale by Cuba to the Soviet Union of 1 million tons of sugar. The purchases made by the United States from Cuba have until only recently been made at the rate of 5 cents per pound. This sugar is shipped to the U.S., the transportation and refining costs paid there, and is sold there and the American people paid for it at the rate of 10 to 11 cents per pound.

By the agreement between Cuba and the Soviet Government, the Soviets pay for the sugar at the rate of 3 cents per pound. But this is paid for

only 20 percent in cash, and the balance in goods shipped from Soviet Russia.

However, that sugar being sold today in Russia to Soviet citizens is paid for at 30 to 40 cents per pound.

The Soviet Government is thereby receiving profits going to the Soviet Government of \$500 million on that million tons of sugar purchased from Cuba. I mention this only to show who gets the better of that trade.

But if these acts of the Castro regime—all of which preceded the reduction in Cuba's share of the United States sugar quota—are said to be commercial and legitimate, then how can a reduction of the degree of preference which Cuba has in the United States sugar market, and which leaves Cuba still in the first position of preference in this hemisphere, be aggression or intervention? There is no such thing as some being more equal than others. All of the American states have equal rights. There cannot be one standard of conduct for the United States and another standard of conduct for the Castro regime.

But Cuban discrimination against United States trade was not the reason for reducing the Cuban sugar quota. Our motive was not retaliatory in purpose. United States commercial policy is based on the principles of nondiscrimination and most-favored-nation treatment. The sugar quota is an exception to this policy. It gives to Cuba the lion's share of the United States sugar market—about 71 percent of United States import requirements as compared with a very small percentage for the balance of Latin America. While Cuba's percentage margin of preference in the United States sugar market has declined slightly over the years, the volume of Cuban sugar sold in the United States market has increased from 2,428,000 short tons for the period of 1901-1930 (the period which the Castro regime has selected as desirable) to 2,580,000 short tons for the period of 1931-1958 (the years about which the Castro regime complains). And Cuba's dollar earnings from sales of sugar in the United States jumped from a depression low of \$39 million to \$100 million in 1936 to \$400 million in 1947 and were at \$350 million in 1959.

Cuba first acquired its preferential position in the U.S. sugar market under the terms of the reciprocity treaty of 1902. In 1934 a quota system

replaced the Smoot-Hawley tariff and gave Cuba a more stable market at better prices. Not only does Cuba enjoy a preference in tariff which gives it a 20 percent advantage over other foreign producers, but, as I have said, it has the lion's share of the foreign quota. This preference, then, has its roots in history and represents a sincere effort on the part of the United States to help the Cuban economy—not, as has been said, to put the Cuban people in economic bondage.

It has sometimes been alleged that we are making this payment to Cuba not to help the Cuban economy but to help the American farmer. This is entirely false, since it would be only too easy to return to the tariff system whereby the difference between prices would be compensated for by a tariff which we ourselves collected—instead, we are giving higher prices to Cuba and others in order that they can pay better wages to those who produce the cane in the respective countries.

Similarly, the payment of premium prices for Cuban sugar, which last year benefited the Cuban economy by roughly \$150 million, was freely and gladly paid with the same constructive end in mind. It is only fair to Cuba to say that the United States also received benefits from this arrangement in the past. In exchange for a premium price, the Cuban sugar industry maintained large stocks which were freely made available to us at fair prices during times of crisis such as the Korean conflict and the Suez incident.

This year, with the termination of the existing congressional authority, it became necessary to obtain new legislation. New considerations influenced United States decisions. First, given the savage attacks on the United States which mounted in intensity week by week, growing Sino-Soviet influence in Cuba, and the repeated assertions by the highest officials in the Castro regime concerning political and commercial advantages of selling Cuban sugar elsewhere, we had to take into account the possibility that a political decision would be taken either to refuse to sell to the United States or to sharply reduce the amount of sugar that would be made available to us. For example, as late as August 13, 1960, the Minister of Finance, Raúl Cepero Bonilla, stated that "for the next year, it would be much more advantageous to Cuba if the United States did not buy a single grain of sugar." These and other state-

ments by officials of the Castro regime were accompanied by agreements committing Cuba to sell large quantities of sugar to the Sino-Soviet bloc, accompanied by indications that the bloc was prepared to barter or purchase even larger quantities of sugar.

I do not wish to dwell here on the inconsistency between the thesis, on the one hand, that Cuba needs to reduce its trade with the United States because the terms offered by the Sino-Soviet bloc are more advantageous and, on the other, the claim that the Cuban economy is damaged by our reduction in the Cuban quota. I only wish to point out that ordinary prudence requires us to take into account that even the possibility that these threats will be carried into effect poses a problem because of our dependence on Cuba for such large quantities of sugar. Of course, alternate sources of supplies can be developed. But this takes time and the assurance—which because of lack of legislation providing for the future we have not been able to give—that expanded production elsewhere will find a durable market in the United States. Second, even if the Castro regime should desire to continue to sell sugar to the United States in the quantities we need, we can have no assurance that it will be able to do so.

Estimates of production are, of course, only estimates, regardless of whether they are made by the United States or by others. Our experts think that Cuba may produce as little as 4,900,000 tons of sugar in 1961. Also, I am informed that the Cuban Foreign Commerce Bank has circulated forms for letters of credit covering jute sugar bags for only 4,800,000 Spanish long tons of sugar. If we accept this estimate of the Cuban Bank, and if we take into account estimates of used sugar bags on hand, it would appear that the Castro regime, in spite of its statements to the contrary, really expects the crop to be somewhere between 4,900,000 and 5,300,000 Spanish long tons. This is a substantial reduction from last year's crop. And there is good reason to believe production will drop still further in the future. But regardless of whether these estimates are accurate, the fact remains that we no longer consider Cuba a safe source of supply in quantities adequate for our needs. This is a judgment which only those who have the responsibility for assuring an ade-

quate supply for the United States consumer can make.

Alleged Curtailment of Commercial Credits

A third charge of aggression, also in the economic field, relates to the alleged curtailment of commercial credits to the Cuban Government and economy. In the United States commercial banks are privately controlled. As a result of certain internal policies of the Cuban Government, a commercial backlog of debts owing to United States exporters was accumulated in excess of \$100 million. The manifest financial and commercial irresponsibility of the Cuban Government and the heavy losses entailed by American institutions engaged in commercial transactions with Cuban enterprises are the reason for curtailment of credit by them. This has not been the result of any policy of the Government of the United States.

The fourth specific charge of aggression, also economic in character, relates to the refusal of two American oil concerns to continue to supply petroleum and its products. These two companies had been supplying products to the Cuban Government for a year and a half without more than token payment. The accumulated indebtedness owing to these companies exceeded \$50 million. Negotiations were in progress looking toward an agreement with the Cuban Government under which a partial payment of this debt would have been accomplished and future deliveries placed on a normal commercial credit basis. At the last minute, however, the Cuban Government imposed a new condition, namely, that the companies use large quantities of Soviet crude in lieu of crude oil produced by these companies in Venezuela. It is not difficult to understand why these companies which are charged with responsibility to their own stockholders were unwilling to become mere agents for the processing of Soviet crude displacing their own production.

Charge of Refusal To Negotiate

One other point. The Cuban Foreign Minister has asserted that the United States Government refused to negotiate with the Revolutionary Government of Cuba when, last February, it decided to name a commission to conduct negotiations in Washington. I need not point out that the Gov-

ernment of Cuba, in its proposal, suggested that the Government of the United States should bind both the Executive and the Congress to refrain from any action whatever which the Government of Cuba might consider to affect its interests while leaving the Government of Cuba free to negotiate or procrastinate as it chose. It is appropriate to ask, however, why the Government of Cuba deliberately refrained from quoting my Government's reply¹² in its entirety. I say deliberately refrained because, Mr. Chairman, this is the third time that the Government of Cuba has truncated this note before responsible international bodies to serve its own purpose in completely distorting the position of the U.S. Government in this matter. The fact is that the part of the United States note which Minister Roa has again deleted from his presentation to this body went on to affirm the friendship between the Cuban and American peoples and to welcome any proposals which the Cuban Government might wish to make, the subjects which might be discussed, as well as the manner and the place in which negotiations might be conducted. It may be well to recall to the Foreign Minister of Cuba the full text of the closing paragraph of the note sent on February 29, 1960, by the U.S. Ambassador in Cuba, which he has again found it so convenient to omit:

The Government of the United States for its part firmly intends to continue by its conduct and through its utterances to reaffirm the spirit of fraternal friendship which, as Your Excellency so well stated, has bound and does bind our two peoples and which the Government of the United States believes is earnestly cherished by them. Prior to the initiation of negotiations and through normal diplomatic channels the Government of the United States would wish to explore with the Government of Cuba the subjects to be discussed and the manner and place in which negotiations might be conducted. Accordingly, I would welcome, for transmittal to my Government, any proposals which Your Excellency might care to submit in these respects.

To this date, despite the several subsequent efforts to elicit a reply from the Government of Cuba, none has been forthcoming. When, shortly after the note referred to above was delivered, the Revolutionary Government of Cuba designated Dr. José Miró Cardona, who preceded Dr. Castro as Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Govern-

¹² For text of U.S. note of Feb. 29, 1960, see BULLETIN of Mar. 21, 1960, p. 440.

ment, as its Ambassador to Washington, there was high expectation that he would carry forward the negotiations. He never arrived. After months of waiting, he was forced to seek asylum in the Argentine Embassy in Havana after protesting the increasing role of communism in Cuba. He is still there.

In conclusion, I wish to distinguish once again between the basic issues which threaten hemispheric peace and security and those of a bilateral character between Cuba and the United States. On the first, we have filed resolutions which we believe contain the essentials for action here. On the latter, I believe that a factfinding commission of the type I have suggested should be established to separate fact from fiction, so that the Organization of American States will have an adequate basis for passing a judgment on the assertions which have been made. An examination of each of these charges will, I am confident, demonstrate that the United States has not only satisfactorily complied with its obligations but has exercised great restraint in the face of continuous provocation.

And finally, Mr. Chairman and fellow Ministers, I wish to turn from these details of problems with the United States, which Cuba has largely created for itself, to the human relationship between the people of the United States and those of Cuba—yes, and those of all Latin America.

As Ambassador Lodge suggested during his discussion of these matters with Foreign Minister Roa in the United Nations, the United States which the Minister has described in such detail is not the United States which we, its citizens, know. Neither is it, I venture to say, the United States which is known to the people of Cuba or to those of the other countries represented here.

Many people from my country live and have lived in your countries, and many from your countries have lived in the United States. We cannot, of course, speak for the impressions which you have of these contacts and associations which have been so constant over the years, but we can and do say that we of the United States value tremendously the friendship of your citizens which has done so much to create in this continent an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding.

We do not believe that this spirit of mutual

purpose in the way of democracy can in the long run be destroyed by forces whose principal motive is to sow hatred and distrust in order that they may deprive every independent nation of the liberty its people enjoy and of the opportunity which it has to move forward toward increased political and economic development in freedom. For our part, I can say that we shall continue unceasingly our efforts to strengthen and develop further the conditions of life and spirit which have made the freedom of the Americas one of the hopes of the world.

DECLARATION OF SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA¹³

Unofficial translation

The Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

1. Condemns emphatically the intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, by an extracontinental power in the affairs of the American republics and declares that the acceptance of a threat of extracontinental intervention by any American state jeopardizes American solidarity and security, wherefor the Organization of American States is under obligation to disapprove it and reject it with equal vigor;

2. Rejects, also, the attempt of the Sino-Soviet powers to make use of the political, economic, or social situation of any American state, inasmuch as that attempt is capable of destroying hemispheric unity and jeopardizing the peace and the security of the hemisphere;

3. Reaffirms the principle of nonintervention by any American state in the internal or external affairs of the other American states, and reiterates that each state has the right to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally, respecting the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality, and as a consequence, no American state may intervene for the purpose of imposing upon another American state its ideologies or political, economic, or social principles;

4. Reaffirms that the inter-American system is incompatible with any form of totalitarianism and that democracy will achieve the full scope of its objectives in the hemisphere only when all the American republics conduct themselves in accordance with the principles stated in the Declaration of Santiago, Chile, which was approved at the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the observance of which it recommends as soon as possible;

5. Proclaims that all member states of the regional organization are under obligation to submit to the discipline of the inter-American system, voluntarily and freely agreed upon, and that the soundest guarantee of their

¹³ Adopted on Aug. 28 by a vote of 19-0. The Dominican Republic did not participate in the Seventh Meeting, and Cuba withdrew before the vote was taken.

sovereignty and their political independence stems from compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the Organization of American States;

6. Declares that all controversies between member states should be resolved by the measures for peaceful solution that are contemplated in the inter-American system;

7. Reaffirms its faith in the regional system and its confidence in the Organization of American States, created to achieve an order of peace and justice that excludes any possible aggression, to promote solidarity among its members, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their political independence, since it is in this Organization that the members find the best guarantee for their evolution and development;

8. Resolves that this declaration shall be known as "The Declaration of San José, Costa Rica."

DEPARTURE STATEMENT, SAN JOSE, AUGUST 29

The two meetings of foreign ministers which have just concluded here in San José have reaffirmed the faith of the governments and people of the hemisphere in the Organization of American States. Our regional organization has proven that the principles on which it is based must be followed equally by all of its members, who have freely submitted to its discipline.

The international conduct of the Governments of two of our members, the Dominican Republic and Cuba, has been the subject of searching scrutiny during our deliberations here in San José. In the Sixth Meeting unprecedented measures directed against the Dominican Government were imposed. The Declaration of San José adopted at the Seventh Meeting constitutes a clear indictment of the Castro government of Cuba. And particularly the role which it has played in furthering the Sino-Soviet efforts of intervention into this hemisphere. The attention of the other American Republics will continue to be focused on the future behavior of the Governments of these two members of the community—judging them on the basis of the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Santiago and the charter of the OAS. The United States delegation firmly associated itself with the feeling of so many of its colleagues in hoping that the people of the Dominican Republic and Cuba will have the opportunity quickly to return their Governments to the principles of freedom and true democracy within the inter-American system.

On leaving San José I wish to pay the highest

tribute to the Government and people of Costa Rica. The warm hospitality and friendship which they extended to our delegations made our stay here unforgettable.

The excellent arrangements, the democratic attitude, and the well-merited pride of the Costa Rican people in their exemplary civic institutions provided an ideal atmosphere for these deliberations we have just concluded. On behalf of my delegation may I extend grateful thanks for all of the kindness which you have extended to us and assure you that the noble example of Costa Rica is one which gives inspiration to efforts to perfect the institutions which give meaning and significance to our American way of life.

ARRIVAL STATEMENT, WASHINGTON, AUGUST 29

Press release 498 dated August 29

There should be no question in anyone's mind as to the success of the meetings of foreign ministers at San José in strengthening the effectiveness of the inter-American system. Through their representatives there, the peoples of the hemisphere expressed their determination to protect their heritage of freedom—not only from Sino-Soviet intervention but also those within the hemisphere who would lend themselves as tools for such intervention.

The indictment at San José of the Castro government of Cuba was clear—both as to its international conduct and its failure to modify its domestic institutions to conform with the principles of representative democracy agreed to by all of the American Republics in the Declaration of Santiago over a year ago.

The collective measures against the Dominican Government, unanimously agreed upon, express the condemnation by the American Republics of the actions taken by the Dominican Republic against another American state and its president. These measures are intended to contribute to the establishment there of a government which will be both representative and responsive to its obligations within the inter-American system.

The sixth and seventh meetings of foreign ministers at San José underscored the obligations of member states to submit themselves to the discipline of the inter-American system. The attention

of the
these
organiz

The
dynam
inter-A
all of
Decla

U.S. S
on C

Press rel

DEPAR

The
tation
Costa
dition
tension
ment,
sponsi
Intern
transm
August

TEXT

SUPPLE
GOVE
IN T

This
the Cu
docume
mittee
tion gi
basic c
signific

1. C
minist
revolut
through
lished
World
2. T
remain
gious
3. C

¹ For
the D
BULLE
ment
numbe

Sept

of the hemisphere will continue to be focused on these two delinquent members of the regional organization.

The inter-American system embodies the dynamism which can expect compliance with the inter-American principles subscribed to freely by all of the American Republics in the Santiago Declaration and the charter of the OAS.

U.S. Submits Supplement to Document on Cuba to OAS Ministerial Meeting

Press release 480 dated August 23

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The U.S. delegation to the Meetings of Consultation of American Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica, has submitted for consideration additional data on Cuban responsibility for increased tensions in the Western Hemisphere. The document, entitled "Supplement to Document on Responsibility of Cuban Government for Increased International Tensions in the Hemisphere," was transmitted to the secretariat of the meeting on August 22, 1960, at San José.

TEXT OF SUPPLEMENT¹

SUPPLEMENT TO DOCUMENT ON RESPONSIBILITY OF CUBAN GOVERNMENT FOR INCREASED INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS IN THE HEMISPHERE

This supplement provides information on the actions of the Cuban Government additional to that provided in the document presented to the Inter-American Peace Committee on August 2, 1960. This supplementary information gives added confirmation to the facts stated in the basic document of August 1, 1960. It brings out three significant additional facts, however.

1. Cuba is establishing a training program for Communist agents and guerrillas to spread the Communist revolution throughout Latin America. This is being done through an international work brigade recently established in Cuba with the support of the Soviet-sponsored World Federation of Democratic Youth.

2. The Cuban Government has opened the assault on the remaining vestige of individual liberty in Cuba—religious freedom.

3. Contradicting previous statements that the US re-

¹For text of the original memorandum, submitted to the Inter-American Peace Committee on Aug. 2, see BULLETIN of Aug. 29, 1960, p. 317. Items in the supplement are keyed to the original memorandum by section numbers and headings.

duction of the Cuban sugar quota constituted "economic aggression," its Minister of Commerce announced it would be "more advantageous to Cuba" if the US ceased all sugar purchases from Cuba.

II. The Practice of the Revolutionary Government in Governing Cuba—Disregard for the Principles Stated in the Declaration of Santiago

D. FREEDOM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

4. Suppression of Labor

Labor delegations to the Latin American Youth Congress joined with the *Confederación de Trabajadores de Cuba* in a joint declaration of August 3, 1960, which:

a) Pledged solidarity by the Cuban and Latin American labor delegates in support for the Cuban revolution and the signing of a mutual assistance pact between the CTC and *Central Único de Trabajadores de Chile* (CUTCH).

b) Hailed the Cuban revolution as opening the way to the national liberation of all Latin America, welcomed the support and friendship of the Soviet Union and Communist China, emphasized the threat of aggression by Yankee imperialism and its "tool", the Organization of American States, and pledged the workers of Latin America to give their lives if necessary to repel such aggression.

c) Endorsed a movement to create a Latin American labor group to support the struggle against internal reactionaries and the forces of imperialist monopolies.

d) Alerted labor organizations to combat any effort by imperialists to use the OAS at San José, Costa Rica, as a means for attacking Cuba.

6. Attacks on Religious Freedom

The Castro dictatorship has moved to eliminate the last remaining vestige of individual liberties in Cuba—the right to freedom of worship. The Communist orientation of the Cuban Government and its relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc concerned the Church so deeply that a pastoral letter on the subject from the Archbishops and Bishops of Cuba was read in Catholic Churches throughout Cuba on August 7, 1960. After expressing strong approval of the original social welfare objectives of the Cuban revolution, the letter said:

"In recent months, the Government of Cuba has established close commercial, cultural, and diplomatic relations with the Governments of the principal Communist countries, especially with the Soviet Union. . . . We are deeply concerned over the fact that, in connection with these events, journalists, members of the Government, labor union leaders, and even certain high Government officials have repeatedly praised warmly the way of life prevailing in those nations, and have suggested in speeches delivered both within and outside of Cuba coincidences and similarities of aims and procedures, between the social revolutions of those countries and the Cuban revolution.

"This point concerns us deeply, because Catholicism

and Communism are based on two diametrically opposed concepts of man and of the world, which can never be reconciled.

"We condemn Communism . . . because it is an essentially materialistic and atheistic doctrine, and because the Governments guided by it are among the worst enemies the Church and mankind have known throughout their history. . . .

"We also condemn Communism because it is a system that brutally denies the fundamental rights of man; because, to obtain total state control of the means of production, they establish everywhere a dictatorial regime in which a small group is installed in power by using police terroristic methods on the rest of the population; . . . because [it converts] all citizens . . . into virtual slaves of the state; . . . because it subordinates family life to the state . . . training children in the manner desired by the government. . . ."

Quite naturally, the reading of this pastoral letter has produced strong reactions from the new governing group of Cuba. Some church-goers were attacked on leaving church, and in one case a priest had to be given police protection from revolutionaries. In another case, pro-Castro elements started fighting within the church. *Revolución*, the semi-official organ of the Government, in its edition of August 8, 1960, defied and threatened the Church.

After a special mass at the ancient Columbus Cathedral in Habana on August 9, revolutionary thugs attacked emerging communicants and insulted, threatened, assaulted and stoned them.

The following day, August 10, President Osvaldo Dorticós, alluding to clashes between church-goers and hecklers and to the arrest of two priests, said that the "provocations" and "counterrevolutionary activities" of Cuban Roman Catholics would be taken care of by "the reaction of revolutionary Catholics." (It is significant to point out that, under the law of the Revolutionary Government, "counterrevolutionary activity" is a crime which may be punishable by death.)

According to the statement of Dr. Castro on August 11, 1960, the "provocations" of the Church were the work of "scribes and Pharisees who are serving Yankee imperialism and its partner, Franco." He added:

"There is no doubt that the American Embassy has thrown into combat its last peons. There is no doubt that imperialism, the partner of Franco and his Fascism, has utilized the influence of Franco so that he will mobilize as many Fascist priests as can be found to fight against the revolution."

Dr. Castro was threatening when, stating that the "responsibility of their provocation" rested on them, he said that the Government would give them "time to realize they are in error, time to reflect and time to change their actions."

Dr. Castro, in condemning the Catholic Church in Cuba, drew a parallel between his Cuban revolution and the earthly career of Jesus Christ when he said:

"Those who condemn [the Cuban revolution] condemn Christ, and they would be capable of crucifying Christ because He did what we are doing."

7. Restriction on Travel

The Cuban Government has recently announced that outstanding exit permits will be cancelled as of August 22, 1960. This will result in a tightened official control

of foreign travel by Cubans and other residents of Cuba, and is suggestive of the practice of Communist governments in this respect. This amounts to a partial raising of what may be called a "cane curtain" serving to isolate the Cuban people from normal and customary contacts with the outside world.

E. EFFECTIVE JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Illustrative of the persecution of the professional classes, in this case the respected Habana Bar Association, which was dispossessed of its offices by a usurping group of Communist-inclined dissident lawyers, is the declaration issued by the Association and published in *Información* on August 6, whereby the Governing Board:

a) Declared the professorships in the School of Law at the University of Habana in dispute, warning that any lawyer performing functions inherent in the professorships would be guilty of breach of professional ethics.

b) Made public its decision to resist the action taken by a small group of lawyers who illegally occupy the Association premises.

c) Suspended the payment of dues to the Association.

d) Urged lawyers to remain away from the offices of the Association, and not to attend meetings called by persons who do not legitimately represent the Association.

A Government-inspired proposal to call a general assembly of the Habana Bar Association to elect a new slate of officers suggests that the technique used to oust legitimate officers of the *Confederación de Trabajadores de Cuba* may be repeated against the Bar Association.

III. Practices of the Cuban Revolutionary Government in International Affairs

A. THE CUBAN GOVERNMENT AND SINO-SOVIET COMMUNISM

1. Cuban Relations with Sino-Soviet Bloc

International Work Brigade. An international work brigade, a common Communist device, has brought to Cuba about 200 persons from numerous countries, including Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, Thailand, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Communist China, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Algeria, Spain, Cyprus, France, Great Britain, Italy, Yugoslavia, Switzerland, and all of the Latin American countries. The members of this work brigade arrived in Habana in the first days of August, 1960, and all are said to be members of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a Communist-dominated organization.

The purposes for which the "brigadeers" have visited Cuba are to assist in the construction of an educational center in the Sierra Maestra, and to do manual work. The last stated purpose is incongruous in the light of the unemployment in Cuba at the present time.

That the work brigade may have other purposes is indicated by the statement of one of the members, who

was quoted in *Revolución* as saying, "We are . . . disposed to defend Cuba with arms if she is attacked."

The international work brigade device further stamps the Government of Dr. Castro as being of a Communist character, and reveals the closeness of its practices to those of the Sino-Soviet pattern.

Scholarships to Communist Countries. Ernesto Guevara has recently stated that a large number of scholarships would soon be given to Cubans to study technological skills in the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Communist China, and that preparatory language courses would be offered in the University of Habana.

Speaking at the opening session of the Latin American Youth Congress on July 28, 1960, Guevara virtually stated that the Cuban revolution is Marxist. According to his statement, if the Cuban movement is Marxist, "it is because the revolution discovered by its method the road that Marx laid out" and "if we do that which is called Marxism, it is because we discovered it."

I. CUBAN INTERVENTIONIST ACTIVITIES IN THE HEMI-SPHERE

2. Support of Revolutionary Movements

On the occasion of the opening of the Latin American Youth Congress on July 28, 1960, in Habana, Ernesto Guevara, eulogized a Puerto Rican rebellion movement, by saying:

"And we wish to greet also one of the delegations that has suffered most perhaps in all America, that of Puerto Rico, which still today . . . keeps fighting to take the first step, perhaps the most difficult one, that of achieving at least formally a free government. And we wish the delegates from Puerto Rico to convey my greeting and that of all Cuba to Pedro Albizu Campos; we wish them to carry to Pedro Albizu Campos all our heartfelt cordiality, all our recognition for the road that he has laid out with his valor, and all our fraternal sentiments as free men toward a free man, in spite of his being in a dungeon of the self-styled North American democracy."

On August 2, at a luncheon given by the Government-controlled news agency, *Prensa Latina*, for the delegates to the Youth Congress, the director of the agency, Jorge Masetti, said:

"We will continue to announce our presence to our brothers in Puerto Rico and Panamá, and we will continue to tell them, 'Plant bombs, throw out the gringos!'"

C. ATTEMPTS TO UNDERMINE INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

1. Attacks by Cuban Leaders

Recent statements by Cuban leaders have again revealed the contempt with which the OAS is regarded by the Cuban Government, and the official Cuban view that Latin American nations which support it are "slaves" and "lackeys" of the U.S.

Raúl Castro, Minister of the Revolutionary Armed

Forces speaking before the *Confederación de Trabajadores de Cuba* (CTC) and the Latin American Youth Congress at Habana on August 4, 1960, stated that US:

... "admirals and generals advocated direct aggression [against Cuba]. The other trend was for multilateral action. . . . An instrument was needed in order to maneuver through multilateral action. This was the OAS, which has lost all its prestige. . . . This organization only serves to legalize the aggressions against Latin America."

He disparaged the OAS further in a television speech the following day:

"We convened an OAS meeting ourselves the other day in the CTC. Representatives from all Latin America were there. We convened the revolutionary OAS at the headquarters of the revolutionary CTC. Latin American youth and leaders expressed the support of 200 million Latin American men and women for the Cuban revolution."

On August 6, 1960, Antonio Núñez Jiménez, Executive Director of the National Agrarian Reform Institute (INRA), in a speech before the Latin American Youth Congress at Habana, said:

"Among the American States there is a vandal, an assassin like Trujillo. There is seated a representative of the Somoza dynasty. There is seated a little old man who dances through the fracas to show his people that he is strong, Ydígoras. And there are seated others, and then they think that they [the US] are going to achieve there [at San José] what they have not achieved by bribery, bombardments, the sugar quota, the petroleum, armed aggression, etc., but I am sure that the next time I speak to you in public I shall bring to view the failure of aggressive intentions by means of the OAS also."

Dr. Castro, the Prime Minister, had more things to say about the OAS in a speech before the closing session of the Latin American Youth Congress on August 7, 1960:

"The accomplices of the Guatemalan affair were the lackeys who used the OAS to support US aggression against a peaceful people, who wanted to wage a revolution in order to free themselves. You must know that the protective doctrine of the Yankees is called 'The Monroe Doctrine' and that they have used this doctrine to make Latin America a protectorate. . . . Now these same gentlemen are trying to maneuver the OAS against us. Why was no OAS meeting called when a ship laden with ammunition mysteriously blew up, after the US Government had failed in its negotiations to prevent a certain country from selling us arms and munitions? Why was no OAS meeting called when the Pentagon met to formulate plans to attack Cuba?"

"Yet when the USSR declares that it will support Cuba if attacked, they do not like it. Obviously, there will not be any need of that support, if we are not attacked. The 'Yankees' have been busy distributing our sugar quota to their servants before the OAS meets. They have been giving up our loans and offering help to their lackeys before the OAS meets. How can these slaves judge our case honestly, if they have already sold their souls to the US imperialists?"

"They are not going to the OAS to give us a fair trial; they are going there to watch Herter's finger and to do what he bids them do."

The Meeting of Foreign Ministers, according to Dr. Castro, was no more than "a Yankee maneuver against Cuba. What does it matter if the OAS condemns us?"

Foreign Minister Raúl Roa, also speaking on August 7,

described the OAS as a "Ministry of Colonies" of the US Government, and said that the coming San José meeting was a new North American maneuver against Cuba. Regarding the Rio Treaty, he said it was an instrument of US military policy. "This treaty, like the Monroe Doctrine, was not made to help Latin America, but to aid the predominance of the US in Latin America."

With respect to the OAS, Roa had the following to say:

"We cannot contaminate ourselves with pre-determined decisions of the OAS; we cannot contaminate ourselves with this atmosphere without carrying an oxygen container in our pocket, the pure and clean oxygen of the Cuban revolution. We neither surrender nor sell ourselves."

A vote against Cuba at San José would not matter, according to Roa. "We would laugh at this, because we would already have denounced all its machinations."

President Osvaldo Dorticós, on August 10, spoke of the Meeting of Foreign Ministers as having been "called to attack our country and our revolution". He went on to say that "Many of the Latin American Governments", who serve the interests of US imperialism, "will serve on their knees the order of their imperialistic boss". He further stated that the Government of Cuba did not feel itself obligated by the 1954 resolution of the OAS at Caracas which called Communism a threat to the Americas.

President Osvaldo Dorticós, on August 13, saluted the Meeting of Foreign Ministers at San José by stating before a mass meeting in Habana that it was invoked by imperialists. He arrogantly added that it would be the Cuban Delegation, not the Foreign Ministers, that would speak for the Latin American peoples.

E. CUBAN ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION AND AGGRESSION

The duplicity of Cuban economic policy was made unmistakably clear on August 13, 1960, by the Minister of Commerce, Dr. Raúl Cepero Bonilla, who informed a television audience:

1. That Cuba's sugar sales had increased under the Castro regime. He did not explain that these sales would result in less income for Cuba or that the cost of production of Cuban sugar exceeds the world market price for which most of the sales to countries other than the US were made.

2. That "for the next year it would be much more advantageous to Cuba if the United States did not buy a single grain of [Cuban] sugar." He did not explain that this was a contradiction of previous statements that the reduction of the Cuban sugar quota in the US market meant "economic aggression" against Cuba, which, in turn, was announced as "justification" for arbitrary seizure of more than \$1 billion invested by private US citizens in Cuba.

3. That Cuba would not sell sugar to countries that might benefit from the reduction in Cuba's sugar quota. This warning was addressed to all countries, but the Minister specifically mentioned Brazil.

United States Severs Relations With Dominican Republic

Department Statement

Press release 489 dated August 26

A United States Embassy official in Ciudad Trujillo today [August 26] delivered a note¹ to the Dominican Foreign Office advising that Government that the Government of the United States was severing diplomatic relations with the Government of the Dominican Republic and was withdrawing its diplomatic mission. This action is in consonance with the decisions taken at the Sixth Meeting of Consultation of American Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica.² At the same time the Dominican Government was requested to recall its diplomatic mission in the United States.

It is expected that consular functions will be continued.

A friendly power has been requested to assume responsibility for diplomatic representation of the United States in the Dominican Republic.

President Asks for Discretion in Purchase of Dominican Sugar

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER³

To the Congress of the United States:

The meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at San Jose, Costa Rica, has just completed its deliberations on the charges made against the Dominican Republic by the Government of Venezuela, as well as on the flagrant violation of human rights by the Trujillo regime.⁴ The Foreign Ministers voted unanimously to condemn the Dominican acts of aggression and intervention against Venezuela, culminating in the attempt on the life of the President of that country, and resolved to (1) break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, and (2) interrupt partially economic relations with that country

¹ Not printed.

² For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1960, p. 355.

³ H. Doc. 451, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

⁴ For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1960, p. 355.

beginning with a suspension of trade in arms and implements of war, with the provision that the Council of the Organization of American States shall study the feasibility and desirability of extending this trade suspension to other articles. The United States joined with the other American Republics in approving these measures.

Some 322,000 short tons of the sugar not being purchased from Cuba pursuant to the reduction in the Cuban quota⁵ is, under the July amendment to the Sugar Act, to be allocated to the Dominican Republic. This allocation is in addition to the Dominican Republic's 1960 quota amounting to approximately 130,000 tons. Since total imports of sugar from the Dominican Republic in 1959 amounted only to about 84,000 tons, the statutory allocation would give that country a large sugar bonus seriously embarrassing to the United States in the conduct of our foreign relations throughout the hemisphere.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the Government should have discretion to purchase elsewhere the quantity apportioned to the Dominican Republic pursuant to the July amendment to the Sugar Act. I therefore request legislation providing that amounts which would be purchased in the Dominican Republic pursuant to the July amendment need not be purchased there, but may be purchased from any foreign countries without regard to allocation.

I would also remind the Congress that the Sugar Act's present termination date of March 31, 1961—only 3 months after the reconvening of Congress next January—could cause a serious gap in supplies, because it often takes as much as 1 or 2 months after purchase for sugar from distant areas to reach our refineries. Thus an extension of the Sugar Act beyond its present termination date is necessary at this session in order to protect consumers in the United States against the possibility of unreasonable prices for sugar next February and March.

I request that the Congress give urgent consideration to and take favorable action on the proposed legislation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 23, 1960.

⁵ *Ibid.*, July 25, 1960, p. 140.

STATEMENT BY ACTING SECRETARY DILLON⁶

The actions of the Trujillo regime, both inside and outside the Dominican Republic, have been for some time the cause of grave concern to the United States and the other nations of the hemisphere.

On June 3d of this year, the Inter-American Peace Committee of the Organization of American States issued a report, in which the United States concurred, which concluded that the Dominican Republic has contributed to political tensions in the Caribbean area by its flagrant violation of human rights including "the use of intimidation and terror as a political weapon." Seven Latin American countries had already broken diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic before the meeting of Foreign Ministers convened on August 16 in San José to discuss the problem which the Trujillo regime presents to the hemisphere.

At this meeting the charges brought against the Dominican Government by Venezuela were considered. The Foreign Ministers voted unanimously to condemn the Dominican acts of aggression and intervention against Venezuela, culminating in the attempt on the life of the President of that country. Under the rules of the OAS, neither Venezuela nor the Dominican Republic participated in the voting. The Ministers resolved (1) to break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and (2) to interrupt partially economic relations with that country beginning with a suspension of trade in arms and implements of war. They also provided that the Council of the Organization of American States shall study the feasibility and desirability of extending this trade suspension to other articles. The United States joined with the other American Republics in approving these measures.

The United States was prepared to go further in attempting to insure that human rights would be respected in the Dominican Republic and that the Dominican people would be permitted to enjoy the benefits of representative democracy. The United States had proposed that a committee of the OAS be established to supervise free elections in the country and that, if the Trujillo regime did not accept such a committee, then economic sanc-

⁶ Made before the House Committee on Agriculture on Aug. 24 (press release 484).

tions would be imposed. The final resolution of the Foreign Ministers, however, took the form just outlined in condemning the present Dominican Government.

In the light of these circumstances it is apparent that the U.S. Government would be in an extremely equivocal position if our Government were now to grant to the Dominican Republic an economic benefit by authorizing the additional purchase of nearly four times as much sugar as the United States imported from that country last year, especially when more than one-third of the purchase value would be a windfall resulting from the premium of the U.S. price over the world price.

To reduce the sugar quota of a country with a leftist dictator only to grant a substantial portion of that quota to a dictator whose activities have been formally condemned by all the American states would seriously handicap the conduct of our foreign relations throughout the hemisphere.

In applying the provisions of section 408(b) (2) of the Sugar Act, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture has, pursuant to Proclamation 3355 of July 6, 1960, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, apportioned and authorized the purchase by private importers of the major part of the amount of sugar by which the Cuban quota has been reduced as a result of that proclamation. In making the apportionment pursuant to subparagraph (iii) of section 408(b) (2), an apportionment of approximately 322,000 short tons, raw value, was made to the Dominican Republic but was "not authorized for purchase at this time."

The importation of approximately 130,000 tons from the Dominican Republic has already been authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture for calendar year 1960. This figure consists of approximately 81,000 tons which is its regular quota and about 50,000 additional tons accruing by law as a result of increases in estimates of United States domestic consumption. If this authorization should be still further increased by an additional 322,000 tons, as a result of the reduction made by the President in U.S. purchases from Cuba, total imports from the Dominican Republic for calendar year 1960 would be approximately 452,000 tons as compared with total imports from that country of about 84,000 tons in 1959.

These facts and considerations lead us to the

conclusion that it is clearly desirable—indeed urgent—that the legislation should explicitly provide that amounts which would be purchased in the Dominican Republic pursuant to subsection (iii) of section 408(b) (2) need not be purchased or may be purchased from any foreign countries without regard to allocation.

King and Queen of Denmark To Visit U.S. in October

The Department of State announced on August 22 (press release 477) that arrangements are being completed for the visit to the United States October 4-17 of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Denmark.

King Frederik and Queen Ingrid, who as Crown Prince and Crown Princess toured the United States in 1939, are returning to this country to make a state visit at the invitation of President Eisenhower. They will arrive at the Military Air Transport Service Terminal, Washington National Airport, on October 11, where they will be met by the President.

Preceding their arrival at Washington, Their Majesties will visit Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chicago. The party will remain in Washington until October 14, when they will depart for New York City and Albany.

Czechoslovakia Queried on Barring of Mail Bearing Masaryk Stamp

Press release 487 dated August 25

Following is the text of a note which the Department of State delivered to the Embassy of Czechoslovakia in Washington on August 24.

The Acting Secretary of State [Douglas Dillon] presents his compliments to the Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic [Jaroslav Žantovský] and refers to the reported rejection by Czechoslovak postal authorities of United States mail bearing postage stamps honoring the late President Thomas Masaryk of Czechoslovakia.

This postage stamp was issued in March 1960¹

¹ BULLETIN of Mar. 28, 1960, p. 494.

in kee
ing le
cause
Lafay
issuan
ceived
States
age st
Czech
vak p
direct
spect
demo
in bel
his li
the A
In
the U
force
ernm
bar i
vakia
oring

Air C
White
WHIT

Th
term
The
Th
1958
form
the 1
of i
the
Comm

Th
for in
and
lishe
at th
statu
and k
FAA
In

¹ Bu

Septe

in keeping with the practice of honoring outstanding leaders of other nations who championed the cause of independence, including such men as Lafayette, Bolivar, and Magsaysay. Since its issuance the United States Government has received many reports from persons in the United States to the effect that letters bearing this postage stamp which they had mailed to addresses in Czechoslovakia had been returned by Czechoslovak postal authorities. This action appears to be directed against a man who has enjoyed great respect in the world for his humanitarian and democratic principles and for his accomplishments in behalf of Czechoslovak statehood and who, in his lifetime, had warm and close associations with the American people.

In the absence of information to the contrary, the United States Government will regretfully be forced to conclude that it is the policy of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to bar international mail to addresses in Czechoslovakia bearing United States postage stamps honoring the late President Masaryk.

Air Coordinating Committee Abolished

White House press release dated August 11

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President has issued an Executive order terminating the Air Coordinating Committee. The order takes effect in 60 days.

The creation of the Federal Aviation Agency in 1958 with responsibilities for many of the matters formerly referred to the ACC, and the inclusion in the 1958 statute of provision for specific types of interagency coordination, have eliminated the need for this Presidentially established Committee.

The Committee was set up in 1946¹ to provide for interagency coordination of aviation activities and responsibilities. The Presidentially established Air Coordinating Committee was needed at that time because of the absence of the present statutory provisions for interagency coordination and because of the narrower responsibilities of the FAA predecessor.

In a memorandum addressed to the heads of

agencies heretofore represented on the Air Coordinating Committee, the President made general provision for future interagency coordination in the aviation field. That coordination pertains to matters which, by reason of law or practical considerations, require agreement of two or more Federal agencies. The President requested the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to take the initiative to bring into being necessary coordinating arrangements. In view of the fact that a preponderance of matters to be coordinated concern international aspects of aviation, the President specifically indicated that there should be established, under the chairmanship of a representative of the FAA, a group to be concerned with the international aviation field. That group would, as a minimum, have members representing the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Civil Aeronautics Board but is to be a small group.

The basic task of the new coordinating group will be to provide recommendations to the Secretary of State on international aviation. The Secretary of State will continue to provide foreign policy guidance to the agencies concerned, to conduct all negotiations with foreign governments, and to appoint and instruct U.S. delegations to international conferences in this field.

In terminating the Air Coordinating Committee the President expressed his thanks to the members and Committee staff and others who assisted for their significant contribution to the advancement of U.S. aviation.

In the Executive order the President directed the Administrator of FAA to make necessary provisions for winding up any outstanding affairs of the ACC.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10883²

TERMINATION OF THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

1. The Air Coordinating Committee is hereby terminated.
2. Executive Order No. 10655 of January 28, 1956, relating to the Air Coordinating Committee, and Executive Order No. 10796 of December 24, 1958, amending that order, are hereby revoked.
3. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall make such provisions as may be necessary for wind-

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 6, 1946, p. 646.

² 25 Fed. Reg. 7710.

ing up any outstanding affairs of the Air Coordinating Committee, and such provisions may be made at any time after the date of this order.

4. Except as provided in paragraph 3, this order shall become effective on the sixtieth day following the date thereof.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 11, 1960.

MEMORANDUM OF AUGUST 11²

Memorandum for The Secretary of State, The Secretary of Defense, The Secretary of the Treasury, The Postmaster General, The Secretary of Commerce, The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

I have today issued an Executive Order terminating the Air Coordinating Committee as of the sixtieth day after today.

Since its inception in 1946, the Air Coordinating Committee has made a significant contribution to the development and coordination of aviation policies and activities of Federal agencies. I wish to thank the members of the Committee, and all who have assisted the Committee, for their services.

It has become evident that a committee established by Presidential Executive Order and concerned with the coordination of both international and domestic aviation matters is no longer needed. In major part, this has resulted from the enactment of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which vested enlarged coordination responsibilities in the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and also provided expressly for certain types of interagency coordination.

It is recognized, however, that suitable substitute methods of interagency coordination of aviation matters will be needed in the future. Any interagency arrangements needed for such coordination can be effected without relying on a Presidentially established committee. Accordingly, it is directed that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall initiate such arrangements as may be appropriate to effect the needed interagency coordination and to meet the related requirements of the agencies concerned. The responsibilities of the Adminis-

trator for establishing such coordination arrangements pursuant to this memorandum will pertain primarily to matters in which agreement of two or more agencies is necessary by reason of either law or practical considerations; in other matters the agency having responsibility should adopt such means of obtaining the advice of and informing other agencies as may be appropriate.

In carrying out the responsibilities assigned to him by this memorandum the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency may, subject to law, cause to be established any committees, councils, working groups and liaison arrangements which he deems to be necessary or desirable. Participation in the activities of any such committee or other similar body should be limited to agencies having a substantial interest in subjects under consideration. Any secretariat services required in connection with any such committee or other body should be supplied by the Federal Aviation Agency except as other arrangements may be agreed to by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and the participating agencies.

The need for formalized interagency coordination, and therefore the need for coordination facilities provided upon the initiative of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, may be expected to be greatest in the international field. Without limiting the foregoing portions of this memorandum, I suggest that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency cause to be established a new interagency group for the purpose of developing recommendations to the Secretary of State. The group should have only a small continuing membership, including, but not necessarily limited to, a representative of the Federal Aviation Agency, as chairman of the group, and representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Board. Any other appropriate agency should participate in the activities of the new group when matters of substantial concern to the agency are under consideration. Any secretariat services for the group should be supplied by the Federal Aviation Agency except as other arrangements may be agreed upon by the Administrator of that Agency and the participating agencies.

The Secretary of State will continue to provide foreign policy guidance to the agencies concerned, to conduct all negotiations with foreign governments, and to appoint and instruct United States delegations to international conferences in this field.

In setting forth in this memorandum certain guidelines respecting arrangements for interagency coordination in the aviation field, it is not my intention to preclude the use of other or additional interagency arrangements permitted by law, with respect to that field.

This memorandum shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

² 25 Fed. Reg. 7710.

THE CONGRESS

President Urges Congress To Restore Mutual Security Fund Cuts

White House press release dated August 26

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

I am gravely concerned by the conference action on mutual security appropriations.

I have repeatedly stated that the appropriation of the full \$4,086 million authorized is vitally needed. Moreover, needs which have developed since my original request, particularly the emergency in the Congo, have made necessary an additional \$100 million for the contingency fund.¹

Only day before yesterday [August 24], by a 67-26 vote, the Senate approved the additional \$100 million and at the same time increased last month's House appropriation of \$3,584 million by \$297 million. The conference, while approving the \$100 million increase in contingency funds, virtually disregarded the Senate restoration in the basic mutual security budget. It accepted only \$31 million—one-tenth of the \$297 million restoration that the Senate had just overwhelmingly approved.

In short, the conference recognized the need for \$100 million of new funds but at the same time slashed by \$265 million the budget to which these new funds are to be added.

This cut would sharply curtail support indispensable to the defense of allies now under intensified Soviet pressure and deny aid urgently needed by other friendly nations struggling under the gravest difficulties to make progress in freedom.

Not only are the funds now provided by the conference inadequate, but also a number of administrative restrictions were retained which would impair the management of the Mutual Security Program.

Surely, in the world situation now confronting

our country, the Congress will not accept these recommendations which fall so short of the need.

I urge that this appropriation be returned to conference. We must, for America, correct its deficiencies.

A congressional rejection of this request will hamper greatly the Nation's Chief Executive who succeeds me next January. Upon him will fall the heavy responsibility of continuing to guide our country in a troubled world. He, no less than I, must have adequate funds to do the job.

LETTER TO SENATE LEADERS

The President on August 26 sent the following letter to Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Majority Leader of the Senate, and to Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Minority Leader of the Senate.

DEAR SENATOR (JOHNSON) (DIRKSEN): I am deeply disturbed by the action yesterday of the conference on the mutual security appropriation. I cannot state too strongly my belief that a cut of this size will jeopardize the security of the country.

I hope the Senate will reject the Conference Report should the House approve it. Both political parties and all of the major national candidates are publicly committed to the support of an adequate mutual security program. No one can responsibly contend that this Conference Report and the amounts approved constitute adequacy in today's world.

In view of the world-wide scope of this program and the necessity for planning so far ahead in such an effort, time is of the essence. These critical matters simply will not wait until the Congress returns in January, then to assess the results of its actions taken now. There is at the moment such an acceleration of events in the world that we must be forearmed at all times and ready to deal with critical situations as they develop. It must be evident to the Congress from the speed with which the situation in Africa recently developed that we must stay ready and that our free world security programs, economic and military, must be kept continuously adequate. Postponement of these funds needed now may irretrievably cripple us later.

I enclose a public statement that I have just released.

I am sending an identical letter to Senator (Johnson) (Dirksen) and similar communications to the House Leaders.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

¹For a statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee by Acting Secretary Dillon, see BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1960, p. 372.

LETTER TO HOUSE LEADERS

The President on August 26 sent the following letter to Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn, and to Congressman Charles A. Halleck, Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. (RAYBURN) (HALLECK): I am deeply disturbed by the action yesterday of the conference on the mutual security appropriation. I cannot state too strongly my belief that a cut of this size will jeopardize the security of the country.

I am writing Senator Johnson and Senator Dirksen urging that the Senate reject this Conference Report should, despite all our efforts, the House approve it. I hope I can count on your cooperation in leading the House to recommit the bill so that the final action can conform fully to the national interest.

Both political parties and all of the major national candidates are publicly committed to the support of an adequate mutual security program. No one can responsibly contend that this Conference Report and the amounts approved constitute adequacy in today's world.

In view of the world-wide scope of this program and the necessity for planning so far ahead in such an effort, time is of the essence. These critical matters simply will not wait until the Congress returns in January, then to assess the results of its actions taken now. There is at the moment such an acceleration of events in the world that we must be forearmed at all times and ready to deal with critical situations as they develop. It must be evident to the Congress from the speed with which the situation in Africa recently developed that we must stay ready and that our free world security programs, economic and military, must be kept continuously adequate. Postponement of these funds needed now may irretrievably cripple us later.

I enclose a public statement that I have just released.

I am sending an identical letter to (Speaker Rayburn) (Mr. Halleck).

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Funds Requested To Finance Export Expansion Program

Statement by Acting Secretary Dillon¹

I appeal to you today to consider favorably requests for appropriations to finance the President's export expansion program. I am particularly concerned with the need for \$1,042,000 to finance the Department of State's activities under this program. Without these additional funds it will be impossible for our Foreign Service establishments to service American business adequately

¹ Made before the Senate Appropriations Committee on Aug. 17 (press release 467).

in its search for foreign markets under increasingly competitive conditions. Today our export markets are more important to the Nation than ever before, and we must do all we can to expand them.

We face a wholly changed international economic situation from that which existed at the end of World War II. In the immediate postwar period, the United States was primarily concerned with rebuilding the war-torn economies of other nations. American goods sold themselves to the extent that other countries were able to pay for them. Then our concern was the "dollar gap." Now, however, the other industrial nations of the world have reconstructed their economies and rebuilt their monetary reserves and are competing strongly for world markets.

As a result of these developments the former "dollar gap" has been replaced by a large deficit in the United States balance of payments. In 1958 the deficit amounted to approximately \$3.4 billion, and in 1959 it rose to \$3.7 billion. Figures for the first half of 1960 indicate that there will be a substantial improvement in our payments situation for this year. Even so, the deficit will be larger than what we can continue to afford. We cannot relax our efforts to assure reasonable equilibrium in our balance of international payments over the years ahead.

World trade is larger than ever before and continues to increase. But the United States must participate in this increased trade on a basis which will yield a sufficiently large export surplus to finance our necessary military expenditures abroad, an adequate outflow of private American investment capital, and a portion of the economic and development assistance which we provide under the Mutual Security Program. In short, an adequate export surplus is essential to our national security, our economic and financial health, and the achievement of our foreign policy objectives.

Removal of Discriminations

The only practicable means to develop the large export surplus we need, and thus to restore a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments, is to substantially expand American exports.

A first and essential step in expanding our exports has already been taken. This is to open world markets to the American trader by removing foreign discriminations against American

goods. The financial need for such trade discrimination has now been largely eliminated, and remarkable progress has been made in removing them. We are confident that quota discriminations against American exports will cease to be a significant obstacle in the very near future. However, the extent to which American trade takes advantage of these new opportunities will depend upon how vigorous an effort American business makes to sell its products abroad against increasingly keen competition in world markets. It is the purpose of the export expansion program to assist American business in this effort.

The Department of State has already stepped up its assistance to American business in developing export markets. The Foreign Service has significantly increased its reporting of information of interest to American exporters. Our missions have made special studies and recommendations regarding specific products which could best be marketed in their countries. In these efforts they have elicited the help and cooperation of American business abroad. The flow of reports from our posts abroad on trade opportunities for American exporters is one-third higher than last year.

Additional Staff Needs

These improvements have been made within present budget limitations. But the further improvements necessary for full implementation of the export program will require staff additions and improved facilities. For this we need the modest additional appropriations we are now requesting.

Our commercial staffs abroad will be expected to increase their efforts to develop specific opportunities for United States exports and generally to improve the services which they offer. This means more personal attention and assistance to American businessmen and more time spent with the foreign business community.

Our embassy staffs will also devote more time to assisting and supporting the increased level of trade fairs, trade missions, and travel promotion activity being planned. In London and Bangkok our missions will be expected to provide general supervision and local personnel for the permanent United States trade centers being planned for those cities as part of the export program.

This planned increase in the commercial activity of our posts abroad will require additional staff. If we are to accomplish the task, the number of

commercial officers abroad will have to be somewhat more than doubled over a 3-year period. We presently have 112 officers assigned to this work. We will need 125 to 150 more if we are to do the job properly. The present supplemental budget request calls for an increase of 39 such commercial officers as the first phase in this program, in addition to 14 new commercial officer positions already included in the regular fiscal year 1961 budget, making a total of 53. The supplemental budget request will permit us to assign commercial officers to 12 cities where no such officers are presently assigned and to make necessary staff increases in 24 other locations. It also provides for necessary additional local employees in order to bring about a strengthening of commercial staffs. The total request for staff, including supporting personnel in the Department, is \$832,405.

Because personal contact with foreign officials and the foreign business community is basic to successful trade promotion, we also are requesting additional representation funds for use by our commercial staffs abroad. For this we are requesting \$27,000.

Measures are also being taken to improve the quality of staff performance. These include better procedures for assignment and staffing, recruitment, career development, tour of duty, and training. The latter is the only one of these qualitative improvements for which funds are being requested. A modest provision is made for introductory training in foreign languages for commercial officers before they report to posts abroad and also for travel costs relating to the training of both local and American commercial officers. This totals \$33,656, which is included in the figure given above for staff strengthening.

It is also essential to improve the commercial facilities available at our posts abroad. In developing the export expansion program, we undertook a post-by-post survey of existing commercial libraries and promotional materials in order to determine the adequacy of present facilities. The present budget request contains \$115,110 for improvements in worldwide facilities based upon the findings of the survey. The expansion in post facilities, like the rest of the program, will be phased over a 3-year period.

The proposed United States trade centers at London and Bangkok are envisaged as pilot projects. Through these trade centers, United States business will be given, for the first time, an op-

portunity to place on permanent display a wide range of United States products in two representative markets. The degree of success achieved will enable us to evaluate this medium of promoting United States exports. The State Department will be responsible for the administrative and housekeeping costs for the two centers, for which \$67,485 is requested.

Other exporting countries now provide their business interests with substantially greater support than we do. For instance, the United Kingdom now has 50 to 55 commercial officers serving in the United States alone compared to our 112 worldwide.

The export expansion program as a whole is designed to provide American business with services and facilities comparable to those now available to their competitors in other countries. We seek to provide the tools that will enable vast numbers of small business concerns, which have never before exported their products, to enter this competitive field with a reasonable chance to make a profit.

Success of the program would produce benefits going beyond the improvement of our balance of payments. It would benefit labor by providing jobs, help business by increasing output and profit opportunity, and help the economies of the countries with whom we trade through the beneficial effects of healthy commerce, through which nations prosper and grow.

The sums presently being requested for this program are modest but of critical importance considering the stakes involved. In my judgment the program has been well conceived and prepared and is essential to the national interest.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

86th Congress, 2d Session

Great Lakes Pilotage Requirements. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on H.R. 10593. March 9-11, 1960. 122 pp.

Organizing for National Security. The National Security Council. Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Part IV. May 10 and 24, 1960. 59 pp.

Organizing for National Security. Mobilizing Talent for Government Service. Hearings before the Subcommit-

tee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Part III. May 11-13, 1960. 145 pp.

Sale of Vested Enemy Property. Hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H.R. 404 and H.R. 1345, bills to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. May 24, 1960. 89 pp.

Disposal of Surplus Property Overseas. Hearing before a special subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee on S. 2605, S. 2725, S. 2732, S. 3154, S. 3489, S. 3288, and S. 3493. June 1, 1960. 166 pp.

Public Law 480 Amendments. Hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 9725, H.R. 11609, H.R. 12104, H.R. 12292, and H.R. 12605. Serial FFF. June 2-14, 1960. 156 pp.

Report on the Operations of the Department of State. Letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a report on the operations of the Department of State under section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, as required by that law. H. Doc. 410. June 3, 1960. 156 pp.

Disarmament Developments, Spring 1960. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. June 10, 1960. 49 pp.

Soviet Espionage Through Poland. Hearing before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Testimony of Pawel Monat. June 13, 1960. 41 pp.

Antarctica Legislation, 1960. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. June 13-14, 1960. 123 pp.

Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 3223, a bill to authorize the appropriation to the Commission of \$7.5 million to be used to carry out the provisions of the act of August 5, 1953, as amended. June 16, 1960. 13 pp.

United States Contributions to International Organizations. Letter from the Acting Secretary of State transmitting the 8th report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations for the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 806, 81st Congress. H. Doc. 418. June 17, 1960. 130 pp.

Amistad Dam and Reservoir. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on H.R. 12263, an act to authorize conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944. June 21-22, 1960. 40 pp.

Extension of Sugar Act of 1948, as Amended. Hearing before the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 12311, H.R. 12534, and H.R. 12624. June 22, 1960. 25 pp.

Report on a Long-range Program for Isthmian Canal Transits. Report of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. H. Rept. 1960. June 23, 1960. 831 pp.

Office of International Travel. Hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H.R. 11342, H.R. 11954, and S. 3102. June 24, 1960. 68 pp.

Ocean Sciences and National Security. Report of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Serial h. H. Rept. 2073. July 1, 1960. 180 pp.

Exposé of Soviet Espionage, May 1960. Prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, and transmitted by direction of the Attorney General for use of the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. S. Doc. 114. July 2, 1960. 41 pp.

Extending for 1 Year the Sugar Act of 1948. Conference report to accompany H.R. 12311. H. Rept. 2090. July 3, 1960. 3 pp.

U.S. Supports U.N. Position in the Congo

*Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge
U.S. Representative in the Security Council¹*

The Secretary-General has again clearly explained his position on the use of the United Nations Force in the Congo, and the United States fully agrees with his views.²

Together with other members of the Security Council the United States believed that Belgian troops should leave the Congo and that United Nations troops should assume responsibility for maintaining order.

We now think that this has been substantially done. The Secretary-General says that all troops will be out within the week. We warmly congratulate the Belgians for the cooperation they have shown in carrying out the decisions of the Security Council under extremely difficult circumstances. We also congratulate the Secretary-General for getting United Nations troops there promptly so as to make possible the withdrawal—and for getting United Nations troops into Katanga. From the beginning the United States has recognized the Congo as one unit.

While we recognize the utility of consultative committees and note with approval the Secretary-General's plans in that regard, we do not think that anyone should represent the Secretary-General in the Congo other than himself or his agents. We recognize the right of the Congo Government to be consulted by the Secretary-General regarding his plans. We believe that he does consult them, that he will do so in the future, and of course we think that he should.

We do consider it unthinkable that the United Nations should ever draw a racial line. The world has suffered too much from racism for it to raise its head here in this organization.

¹Made in the Security Council on Aug. 22 (a.m.) (U.S./U.N. press release 3461).

²For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1960, p. 384.

Mr. [Vasily V.] Kuznetsov [Soviet representative] has referred to the possibility of so-called "volunteers" from Africa as well as from other continents coming to the aid of the Congo.

The United States is opposed to such "volunteers." The United States has made it clear many times that we think that the United Nations should act exclusively in the Congo. When we say "exclusively," we mean not only to exclude "volunteers" but incursions from any quarter.

We think that Mr. Kuznetsov cannot have meant what he said when, in connection with the matter we are now considering, he spoke of the Canadians and the Belgians being allies in NATO. Surely he knows that the Canadians and the Belgians are allies only as regards an attack from the Soviet Union. This is neither germane nor relevant to the Congo. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Kuznetsov's suggestion that the Canadian troops should not serve with the Congo force is quite incomprehensible. The Secretary-General has explained why he needed Canadian help. The United States cannot accept any implication that Canada with its magnificent record will not fully and loyally discharge its responsibilities to the United Nations.

Something has been said about the Americans who were employed in the United Nations technical assistance plan in the Congo, and Mr. Kuznetsov complained about them. I would like to say that they are working under a plan approved by the Secretary-General and Prime Minister [Patrice] Lumumba. That is good enough for us, and we think, in view of Mr. Kuznetsov's protestations of loyalty to Mr. Lumumba, that it should be good enough for him.

In any case the few American experts cannot, as Mr. Kuznetsov alleged, threaten the independence of the Congo. No one has ever been enslaved by the United States. These American experts are not under the orders of the United States Government. I do not know whether the Soviet Union regards its citizens who are employed by the United Nations and its agencies as being under

the orders of the Soviet Government, but I can assure him that United States citizens who work for the United Nations are in no position of that kind.

Mr. President, the United Nations is doing a vital job to prevent Congo from becoming an object of international contention and thus a cause of war. This in itself deserves wholehearted support. But beyond that the United Nations is laying the foundations for law and order, for sound administration, and for economic recovery.

This is no time to be looking for fly specks. We are embarked on a great adventure. Let us all get behind this project and put our shoulders to the wheel.

U.S. Asks Inclusion of Item on Hungary in G.A. Agenda

Following are texts of a letter and explanatory memorandum from Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, to U.N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld.

U.S./U.N. press release 3460 dated August 21

AUGUST 20, 1960

EXCELLENCY: On the instructions of my Government I have the honor to request that an item entitled "The Question of Hungary" be included as a supplementary item in the agenda of the Fifteenth General Assembly. In accordance with Rule 20, an explanatory memorandum is enclosed.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

HENRY CABOT LODGE

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

The Fourteenth General Assembly in resolution 1454 (XIV),¹ after considering the report of the United Nations Special Representative on Hungary and deploring the continued disregard of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the present Hungarian regime of the General Assembly's resolutions on Hungary, requested Sir Leslie Munro to continue his efforts and called upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and

the present authorities in Hungary to cooperate with him.

On April 8, 1960, the United Nations Special Representative on Hungary announced during a press conference in Geneva that his efforts to consult with Soviet and Hungarian authorities had been rejected. Under these circumstances, and in the absence of any indication that the Soviet and Hungarian authorities are prepared to cooperate with Sir Leslie Munro, we believe that the members of the United Nations should consider further the question of Hungary at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

FAO Conference on Fishery Products To Be Held in U.S. in 1961

Press release 490 dated August 26

The U.S. Government will serve as host to a world conference on the nutritional value of fishery products, sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, scheduled to be held at Washington during the last 2 weeks in September 1961.

The conference will deal with the benefits of fishery products, both for human food and for animal feeding. Considerable research has been accomplished in the United States and in other countries on this subject, and the conference will endeavor to assemble this wealth of widely dispersed information. Recent nutritional research findings by the Department of Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries have shown the importance of fishery products to protein malnutrition, which affects nearly two-thirds of the world's population.

About 400 authorities on nutrition, representing some 80 nations, are expected to attend the conference.

President Appoints John W. Hanes, Jr. to Caribbean Commission

The Department of State announced on August 26 (press release 492) that the White House on that date had announced the appointment of John W. Hanes, Jr., to be a Commissioner and Chairman of the U.S. section of the Caribbean Commission, vice Roderic L. O'Connor.

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of Dec. 28, 1959, p. 946.

TREATY INFORMATION

United States and Mexico Sign New Air Transport Agreement

JOINT ANNOUNCEMENT, AUGUST 13

Press release 458 dated August 13

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States announced today that their delegates have successfully completed discussions for the conclusion of an air transport agreement between the two countries, which will replace the provisional arrangement on civil aviation which has been in force since 1957.¹ The new agreement will be signed in the course of the next week, and will enter into effect as of August 15, 1960.

The new agreement represents the successful conclusion of meetings which took place recently at Washington, D.C., and México, D.F. In the course of these meetings, delegations appointed by the respective governments agreed that the experimental period which the provisional arrangement of 1957 was designed to meet had been successfully completed and that air services between the two countries should now be placed on a more permanent and stable basis, commensurate with the cordial relations between them. Accordingly, the agreement is based upon the friendly relations between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States, the contiguity of their respective territories, and the mutual desire to strengthen even more the cultural and economic ties which bind their peoples and the understanding and good will which exist between them. It recognizes the increasing importance of international air travel between the two countries and within the Hemisphere, and the mutual desire to ensure continued development of such travel in the common welfare and on a basis of equality and reciprocity.

In order to facilitate the attainment of the aforementioned objectives, the agreement provides for a significant expansion in the routes to be served by the United States and Mexican airlines, and sets forth liberal principles under which the respective services will be provided.

TEXT OF AGREEMENT

AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States,

Considering the contiguity of their respective territories and the friendly relations between them;

Desiring to strengthen even more the cultural and economic bonds which link their peoples and the understanding and goodwill which exists among them;

Recognizing the increasing importance of international air travel between the two countries and within the Hemisphere and desiring to ensure its continued development in the common welfare on bases of equality and reciprocity; and

Desiring to conclude an Agreement which will facilitate the attainment of the aforementioned objectives;

Have accordingly appointed duly authorized representatives for this purpose, who have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

For the purposes of the present Agreement:

A.—The word "Agreement" shall mean the Agreement and the Route Schedule annexed thereto.

B.—The term "aeronautical authorities" shall mean, in the case of the United States of America, the Civil Aeronautics Board or any person or agency authorized to perform the functions exercised at the present time by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and, in the case of the United Mexican States, the Ministry of Communications and Transport or any person or entity authorized to perform the functions exercised at present by the Ministry of Communications and Transport.

C.—The term "airline" shall mean any air transport enterprise offering or operating an international air service.

¹For text, see BULLETIN of Apr. 8, 1957, p. 575.

D.—The term "designated airline" shall mean an airline which the aeronautical authorities of one contracting party have notified the aeronautical authorities of the other contracting party to be the airline which will operate a route or routes specified in the Route Schedule annexed to the Agreement. Such notification must have been communicated in writing, through diplomatic channels.

E.—The term "territory", in relation to a State, shall mean the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection, jurisdiction or trusteeship of that State.

F.—The term "air service" shall mean any scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, cargo or mail.

G.—The term "international air service" shall mean an air service which passes through the air space over the territory of more than one State.

H.—The term "stop for non-traffic purposes" (technical stop) shall mean a landing for any purpose other than taking on or discharging passengers, cargo or mail.

ARTICLE 2

Each party grants to the other party rights necessary for the conduct of air services by the designated airlines, as follows: the rights of transit, of stops for non-traffic purposes, and of commercial entry and departure for international traffic in passengers, cargo, and mail at the points in its territory named on each of the routes specified in the appropriate paragraph of the annexed Route Schedule. The fact that such rights may not be exercised immediately shall not preclude the subsequent inauguration of air services by the airlines of the party to whom such rights are granted over the routes specified in the said Route Schedule.

ARTICLE 3

Air service on a specified route may be inaugurated immediately or at a later date at the option of the party to whom the rights are granted by an airline or airlines of such party at any time after that party has designated such airline or airlines for that route and the other party has given the appropriate operating permission. Such other party shall, subject to Article 4, be bound to give this permission provided that the designated airline or airlines may be required to qualify before the competent aeronautical authorities of that party, under the laws and regulations normally applied by these authorities, before being permitted to engage in the operations contemplated in this Agreement.

ARTICLE 4

Each party reserves the right to withhold or revoke the operating permission provided for in Article 3 of this Agreement from an airline designated by the other party in the event that it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control of such airline are vested in nationals of the other party or in case of failure by such airline to comply with the laws and regulations referred to in Article 5 of this Agreement, or in case of the failure of the airline or the Government designating it to fulfill the conditions under which the rights are granted in accordance with this Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

A. The laws and regulations of one party relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of the airline or airlines designated by the other party and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from, and while within the territory of the first party.

B. The laws and regulations of one party relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew, or cargo of the other party upon entrance into or departure from, and while within the territory of the first party.

ARTICLE 6

Certificates of airworthiness, certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by one party, and still in force, shall be recognized as valid by the other party for the purpose of operating the routes and services provided for in this Agreement provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which may be established pursuant to the Convention on International Civil Aviation. Each party reserves the right, however, to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to its own nationals by another state.

ARTICLE 7

In order to prevent discriminatory practices and to assure equality of treatment, both parties agree further to observe the following principles:

(a) Each of the parties may impose or permit to be imposed just and reasonable charges for the use of public airports and other facilities under its control. Each of the parties agrees, however, that these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services.

(b) Fuel, lubricating oils, consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores introduced into the territory of one party by the other party or its nationals, and intended solely for use by aircraft of such party shall be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from custom duties, inspection fees and other national duties or charges.

(c) Fuel, lubricating oils, other consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores retained on board aircraft of the airlines of one party authorized to operate the routes and services provided for in this Agreement shall, upon arriving in or leaving the territory of the other party, be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, inspection fees and other national duties or charges, even though such supplies be used or consumed by such aircraft on flights in that territory.

(d) Fuel, lubricating oils, other consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores taken on board aircraft of the airlines of one party in the territory of the other and use in international services shall be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, excise taxes, inspection fees and other national duties or charges.

ARTICLE 8

There shall be a fair and equal opportunity for the airlines of each party to operate on any route listed in this Agreement.

ARTICLE 9

In the operation by the airlines of either party of the trunk services described in this Agreement, the interest of the airlines of the other party shall be taken into consideration so as not to affect unduly the services which the latter provides on all or part of the same routes.

ARTICLE 10

The air services made available to the public by the airlines operating under this Agreement shall bear a close relationship to the requirements of the public for such services.

It is understood that services provided by a designated airline under the present Agreement shall retain as their primary objective the provision of capacity adequate to the traffic demands between the country of which such airline is a national and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic. The right to embark or disembark on such services international traffic destined for and coming from third countries at a point or points on the routes specified in the Route Schedule shall be applied in accordance with the general principles of orderly development to which both parties subscribe and shall be subject to the general principle that capacity should be related:

(a) to traffic requirements between the country of origin and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic;

(b) to the requirements of through airline operation; and,

(c) to the traffic requirements of the area through which the airline passes after taking account of local and regional services.

Both parties agree to recognize that the fifth freedom traffic is complementary to the traffic requirements on the routes between the territories of the parties, and at the same time is subsidiary in relation to the traffic requirements of the third and fourth freedom between the territory of the other party and a country on the route.

In this connection both parties recognize that the development of local and regional services is a legitimate right of each of their countries. They agree therefore to consult periodically on the manner in which the standards mentioned in this Article are being complied with by their respective airlines, in order to assure that their respective interests in the local and regional services as well as through services are not being prejudiced.

Every change of gauge justifiable for reasons of economy of operation, shall be permitted at any stop on the specified routes. Nevertheless, no change of gauge

may be made in the territory of one or the other party when it modifies the characteristics of the operation of a through airline service or if it is incompatible with the principles enunciated in the present Agreement.

When one of the parties after a period of observation of not less than ninety days considers that an increase in capacity or frequency offered by an airline of the other party is unjustified or prejudicial to the services of its respective airline it shall notify the other party of its objection to the end that consultation is initiated between the appropriate aeronautical authorities and decision on the objection is made by mutual agreement within a period which may not be more than ninety days beginning on the date of such notification. For this purpose the operating companies shall supply all traffic statistics that may be necessary and required of them.

ARTICLE 11

1.-All rates to be charged by an airline of one contracting party to or from points in the territory of the other contracting party shall be established at reasonable levels, due regard being paid to all relevant factors, such as costs of operation, reasonable profit, and the rates charged by any other carriers, as well as the characteristics of each service. Such rates shall be subject to the approval of the aeronautical authorities of the parties, who shall act in accordance with their obligations under this Agreement, within the limits of their legal powers.

2.-Any rate proposed to be charged by an airline of either contracting party for carriage to or from the territory of the other contracting party, shall, if so required, be filed by such airline with the aeronautical authorities of the other contracting party at least thirty (30) days before the proposed date of introduction unless the contracting party with whom the filing is to be made permits filing on shorter notice. The aeronautical authorities of each contracting party shall use their best efforts to insure that the rates charged and collected conform to the rates filed with either contracting party, and that no carrier rebates any portion of such rates, by any means, directly or indirectly, including the payment of excessive sales commissions to agents or the use of unrealistic currency conversion rates.

3.-It is recognized by both contracting parties that during any period for which either contracting party has approved the traffic conference procedures of the International Air Transport Association, or other associations of international air carriers, any rate agreements concluded through these procedures and involving airlines of that contracting party will be subject to the approval of that contracting party.

4.-If a contracting party, on receipt of the notification referred to in paragraph 2 above, is dissatisfied with the rate proposed, it shall so inform the other contracting party at least fifteen (15) days prior to the date that such rate would otherwise become effective, and the contracting parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate.

5.-If a contracting party upon review of an existing rate charged for carriage to or from its territory by an airline of the other contracting party is dissatisfied with that rate, it shall so notify the other contracting party

and the contracting parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate.

6.—In the event that an agreement is reached pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 4 or 5, each contracting party will exercise its best efforts to put such rate into effect.

7.—(a) If under the circumstances set forth in paragraph 4 no agreement can be reached prior to the date that such rate would otherwise become effective, or

(b) If under the circumstances set forth in paragraph 5 no agreement can be reached prior to the expiry of sixty (60) days from the date of notification:

then the contracting party raising the objection to the rate may take such steps as it may consider necessary to prevent the inauguration or the continuation of the service in question at the rate complained of *provided, however*, that the contracting party raising the objection shall not require the charging of a rate higher than the lowest rate charged by its own airline or airlines for comparable service between the same pair of points.

8.—When in any case under paragraphs 4 and 5 of this Article the aeronautical authorities of the two contracting parties cannot agree within a reasonable time upon the appropriate rate after consultation initiated by the complaint of one contracting party concerning the proposed rate or an existing rate of the airline or airlines of the other contracting party, upon the request of either, the terms of Article 13 of this Agreement shall apply. In rendering its advisory opinion, the arbitral tribunal shall be guided by the principles laid down in this Article.

9.—Unless otherwise agreed between the parties, each contracting party undertakes to use its best efforts to insure that any rate specified in terms of the national currency of one of the parties will be established in an amount which reflects the effective exchange rate (including all exchange fees or other charges) at which the airlines of both parties can convert and remit the revenues from their transport operations into the national currency of the other party.

ARTICLE 12

Consultation between the competent authorities of both parties may be requested at any time by either party for the purpose of discussing the interpretation, application, or amendment of this Agreement. Such consultation shall begin within a period of sixty (60) days from the date of the receipt of the request by the Department of State of the United States of America or the Ministry of Foreign Relations of the United Mexican States as the case may be. Should agreement be reached on amendment of the Agreement, such amendment will come into effect upon confirmation by a further exchange of diplomatic notes.

ARTICLE 13

Except as otherwise provided, any dispute between the parties relative to the interpretation or application of this Agreement which cannot be settled through consultation shall be submitted for an advisory report to a tribunal of three arbitrators, one to be named by each party, and the third to be agreed upon by the two arbitrators so chosen, provided that such third arbitrator shall not be

a national of either party. Each of the parties shall designate an arbitrator within two months of the date of delivery by either party to the other party of a diplomatic note requesting arbitration of a dispute; and the third arbitrator shall be agreed upon within one month after such period of two months.

If either of the parties fails to designate its own arbitrator within two months, or if the third arbitrator is not agreed upon within the time limit indicated, either party may request the President of the International Court of Justice to make the necessary appointment or appointments by choosing the arbitrator or arbitrators.

The parties will use their best efforts under the powers available to them to put into effect the opinion expressed in any such advisory report. A moiety of the expenses of the arbitral tribunal shall be borne by each party.

ARTICLE 14

This Agreement, all amendments thereto, and contracts connected therewith shall be registered with the International Civil Aviation Organization.

ARTICLE 15

If a general multilateral air transport Convention accepted by both parties enters into force, the present Agreement shall be amended so as to conform with the provisions of such Convention.

ARTICLE 16

Either of the two parties may at any time notify the other party of its intention to terminate the present Agreement. Such notice shall be sent simultaneously to the International Civil Aviation Organization. In case such notification should be given the Agreement would terminate six months after the date on which the notice of termination may have been received, unless the communication under reference is annulled before the end of this period by agreement between both parties. Should the other party not acknowledge receipt it shall be considered that the notification was received by it 14 days subsequent to the date on which it is received by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

ARTICLE 17

Upon entry into effect of the present Agreement the aeronautical authorities of the two parties must communicate to each other as soon as possible the information relating to authorizations given to the airline or airlines designated by them to operate the routes set forth in the Route Schedule.

ARTICLE 18

The present Agreement shall enter into effect provisionally as of the fifteenth day of August, one thousand nine hundred sixty, and will enter into force definitively upon receipt by the Government of the United States of America of notification from the Government of the United Mexican States that the Agreement has been approved by the Senate of the Republic.

The Agreement will remain effective for a period of three years from the fifteenth day of August, one thousand nine hundred sixty unless terminated earlier by action pursuant to Article 16 of this Agreement.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, being duly au-

thorized by their respective Governments, have signed the present Agreement.

Done in duplicate at Mexico City in the English and Spanish languages, both texts being equally authentic, this fifteenth day of August, one thousand nine hundred sixty.

For the Government of the United States of America: For the Government of the United Mexican States:

ROBERT C. HILL

W. BUCHANAN

ROUTE SCHEDULE

1.-An airline or airlines designated by the Government of the United States of America shall be entitled to operate air services on each of the air routes specified via intermediate points, in both directions, and to make scheduled stops in Mexico at the points specified in this paragraph:

- A. New York, Washington-Mexico City.
- B. Chicago, Dallas, Fort Worth-Mexico City, via intermediate points in the United States.
- C. Los Angeles-Mexico City, via intermediate points in the United States.
- D. New Orleans-Mexico City.
- E. New Orleans-Merida and beyond to Guatemala and beyond.
- F. Miami-Merida and beyond to Guatemala and beyond.
- G. Houston-Mexico City and beyond to Guatemala and beyond, via intermediate points in the United States.
- H. San Antonio-Mexico City.
- I. Miami, Tampa/St. Petersburg-Merida and Cozumel and beyond (cargo and mail only).
- J. Miami, Tampa-Merida, Mexico City.

2.-An airline or airlines designated by the Government of the United Mexican States shall be entitled to operate air services on each of the air routes specified via intermediate points, in both directions, and to make scheduled landings in the United States at the points specified in this paragraph:

- A. Mexico City-Washington, New York and beyond New York to Europe.
- B. Mexico City-Dallas, Fort Worth, Chicago, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- C. Mexico City-Los Angeles, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- D. Mazatlan, Torreon, Monterrey-San Antonio, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- E. Mexico City-Miami and beyond.
- F. La Paz, Baja California-Los Angeles, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- G. Mexico City, Monterrey-San Antonio.
- H. Hermosillo-Tucson, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- I. (Pending).

3.-Points on any of the specified routes may at the option of the designated airlines be omitted on any or all flights with the exception of United States Route J, on which the designated airline is required to make an intermediate stop at Merida.

ROBERT C. HILL

W. BUCHANAN

Weapons Development Agreement Concluded With Australia

Press release 481 dated August 23

The Governments of the United States and Australia on August 23 concluded a Mutual Weapons Development Program agreement which provides for technical cooperation in research and development activities. The agreement was signed by the Australian Ambassador, Howard Beale, and the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, J. Graham Parsons.

Under this agreement, the United States and Australia will jointly participate, financially and technically, in the development of mutually agreed projects that will assist in the defense of Australia and improve the strength of the free world. The agreement also provides for a wider exchange of scientific and technical military information designed to improve military research and development in Australia and avoid duplication of effort.

The signing of this agreement marks the first time that the Mutual Weapons Development Program has been undertaken outside of NATO.

U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement Terminated August 25

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

White House press release dated August 24

The President has issued a proclamation giving effect to the termination of the trade agreement between the United States and Iran.

The Government of Iran requested the termination of that 1943 agreement in order to carry forward its economic stabilization program. This was effected, as announced earlier by the Department of State,¹ through an exchange of notes by the two Governments on July 27, 1960.

The termination of the agreement alters the tariff treatment of certain articles imported into the United States.

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 15, 1960, p. 261.

PROCLAMATION 3366²

TERMINATION OF THE IRANIAN TRADE AGREEMENT PROCLAMATIONS

1. WHEREAS, under the authority vested in him by section 350(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the act of June 12, 1934, entitled "An Act To Amend the Tariff Act of 1930", 48 Stat. 943, and the joint resolutions of Congress approved March 1, 1937, 50 Stat. 24, and April 12, 1940, 54 Stat. 107, the President entered into a trade agreement with His Imperial Majesty the Shah-in-Shah of Iran on April 8, 1943, 58 Stat. 1322, and proclaimed such trade agreement by proclamation dated March 31, 1944 (58 Stat. 1322), and the effective date thereof by proclamation dated May 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1356);

2. WHEREAS the Government of the United States of America and the Imperial Government of Iran have agreed to terminate such trade agreement as of August 25, 1960; and

3. WHEREAS paragraph (6) of section 350(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, authorizes the President to terminate, in whole or in part, any proclamation

² 25 Fed. Reg. 8279.

carrying out a trade agreement entered into under such section:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 350(a) (6) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, do hereby proclaim that the proclamations dated March 31, 1944, and May 29, 1944, specified in the first recital of this proclamation, shall terminate as of the close of August 25, 1960.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-fourth day of August in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

By the President:
DOUGLAS DILLON,
Acting Secretary of State.

LIST OF IMPORTS AFFECTED

CHANGES IN UNITED STATES IMPORT DUTIES RESULTING FROM TERMINATION OF UNITED STATES-IRAN TRADE AGREEMENT OF 1943

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rates of duty	
		Trade agreement	New rate
736	Barberries, edible, dried, desiccated or evaporated.....	1½ cents per pound..	2½ cents per pound.
762	Apricot and peach kernels.....	2½ cents per pound..	3 cents per pound.
911(a)	Quilts or bedspreads, wholly or in chief value of cotton, whether in the piece or otherwise, if block-printed by hand.	12½% a.v.....	25% a.v.
911(b)	Table and bureau covers, centerpieces, runners, scarfs, napkins, and doilies, made of plain-woven cotton cloth, and not specially provided for, if block-printed by hand.	15% a.v.....	30% a.v.
1102(b)	Hair of the Cashmere goat:		
	In the grease or washed.....	18 cents per pound of clean content.	34 cents.
	Scoured.....	21 cents per pound of clean content.	37 cents.
	On the skin.....	16 cents per pound of clean content.	32 cents.
	Sorted, or matchings, if not scoured.....	19 cents per pound of clean content.	35 cents.
1552	Cigar and cigarette boxes, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for: Wholly or in chief value of silver and valued at 40 cents or more per ounce.	30% a.v.....	60% a.v.

Current

Agricultural

Convent
cultu
1944.
1169.
Ratifi
Protocol
Amer
ary 11
Wash
Signa
1960
Ratifi
Adher
Intern
Decen
Adher
JUN

Antarctic

The An
1, 195
Ratifi
Nor

Postal

Univers
regul
mail
1957.
Ratifi

Publica

Convent
licati
Ratifi
Convent
tions
Adopt
force
Ratifi

Shippin

Convent
tive C
Enter
Accept

Telecom

Telegra
to th
Decen
final
Enter
Notifi

* Not
* Not
* Will
date.

Septem

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Agriculture

Convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. Done at Washington January 15, 1944. Entered into force November 30, 1944. 58 Stat. 1169.

Ratification deposited: Uruguay, March 22, 1960.
Protocol of amendment to the convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences of January 15, 1944 (58 Stat. 1169). Opened for signature at Washington December 1, 1958.¹

Signatures: Peru, March 24, 1960; Nicaragua, April 19, 1960.

Ratification deposited: Costa Rica, May 9, 1960.

Adherence deposited: Uruguay, March 22, 1960.

International plant protection convention. Done at Rome December 6, 1951. Entered into force April 3, 1952.²

Adherences deposited: Hungary, May 17, 1960; Finland, June 22, 1960.

Antarctica

The Antarctic Treaty. Signed at Washington December 1, 1959.³

Ratifications deposited: United States, August 18, 1960; Norway, August 24, 1960.

Postal Services

Universal postal convention with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding air-mail with final protocol. Done at Ottawa October 3, 1957. Entered into force April 1, 1959. TIAS 4202.

Ratification deposited: Thailand, July 21, 1960.

Publications

Convention concerning the international exchange of publications. Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958.¹

Ratification deposited: France, May 30, 1960.

Convention concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between states. Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958. Will enter into force May 31, 1961.²

Ratification deposited: France, May 30, 1960.

Shipping

Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Signed at Geneva March 6, 1948. Entered into force March 17, 1958. TIAS 4044.

Acceptance deposited: Kuwait, July 5, 1960.

Telecommunications

Telegraph regulations (Geneva revision, 1958) annexed to the international telecommunication convention of December 22, 1952 (TIAS 3266), with appendixes and final protocol. Done at Geneva November 29, 1958. Entered into force January 1, 1960. TIAS 4390.

Notification of approval: June 16, 1960.

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

³ Will not enter into force for the United States on this date.

BILATERAL

Australia

Mutual weapons development program agreement. Signed at Washington August 23, 1960. Entered into force August 23, 1960.

Germany

Second agreement regarding certain matters arising from the validation of German dollar bonds. Signed at Bonn August 16, 1960. Enters into force upon the exchange of ratifications.

Guatemala

Agreement providing for investment guaranties. Effected by exchange of notes at Guatemala August 9, 1960. Enters into force on the date of notification by Guatemala of ratification pursuant to its constitutional procedures.

Italy

Agreement amending the agreement of March 9 and October 27, 1959, relating to the procedures for the reciprocal filing of classified patent applications. Effected by exchange of notes at Rome April 29 and August 2, 1960. Entered into force August 3, 1960.

Mexico

Air transport agreement. Signed at México August 15, 1960. Entered into force provisionally August 15, 1960. Enters into force definitively upon receipt by the United States of notification that the agreement has been approved by the Mexican Senate.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Appointments

Walter G. Whitman as Science Adviser, effective September 4. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 491 dated August 26.)

Designations

William W. Walker as Deputy Director, Office of Personnel, effective August 18.

PUBLICATIONS

Department Limits Use of Documents Prior to Official Publication

Press release 483 dated August 23

The Department of State has from time to time permitted scholars to look at cleared documentary material while it was in the process of being prepared for publication. Normally the resulting

historical studies are published at about the same time as, or later than, the release of the official documentation. This same procedure was followed in providing access to certain authors who asked to see the material on the Potsdam Conference during its preparation.

The recent book *War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference* by Dr. Herbert Feis and the book *No High Ground* by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey were based on access to these cleared documents as described above. In the light of the extension of use of this material for a current newspaper series the Department has decided to suspend the granting of access to such material before official publication.

The discovery of relevant additional documentation on the Potsdam Conference at a late stage of the editorial work has made it impossible to complete the publication of the two volumes on the Potsdam Conference until early in 1961 because of extensive necessary revisions in the page proof, the requirements for new pagination, and the complete revision of the index which is required to make the volumes useful to the reader.

The Department has assigned a high priority to the completion of the two volumes of Potsdam papers but, in the light of the recently acquired additional material and in the interests of presenting a complete documentation, regrets that it will not be able to publish the two volumes before early 1961.

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Mutual Security in Action—Israel. Pub. 6985. Near and Middle Eastern Series 51. 13 pp. 10¢.

A fact sheet describing the country, government, economy, and the U.S. economic assistance program.

Mutual Security in Action—India. Pub. 6988. Near and Middle Eastern Series 52. 20 pp. 10¢.

A fact sheet giving background information on the country and discussing its economy, government, and the extent of U.S. assistance.

Communist Economic Policy in the Less Developed Areas. Pub. 7020. European and British Commonwealth Series 60. 38 pp. 20¢.

This pamphlet brings up to date the Department of State study entitled *The Communist Economic Threat*, published in 1959. Since the Communist program of economic penetration has extended to additional free-world countries while becoming increasingly active in the countries it has already penetrated, this publication deals with the

subject on a wider scale, covering the general characteristics of Communist economic policy in less developed areas, the nature of the offensive, the trade drive, and the geographic areas of concentration.

Agreement Establishing the Inter-American Development Bank. TIAS 4397. 160 pp. 50¢.

Between the United States of America and Other Governments. Done at Washington April 8, 1959. Entered into force December 30, 1959.

Money Orders. TIAS 4483. 7 pp. 10¢.

Convention between the postal administrations of the United States of America and the British Colony of Saint Christopher Nevis and Anguilla, West Indies. Signed at Basseterre, St. Kitts, British West Indies, June 27, 1959, and at Washington September 14, 1959. Entered into force February 1, 1960.

Defense—Weapons Production Program. TIAS 4484. 9 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Denmark. Exchange of notes—Signed at Copenhagen April 12, 1960. Entered into force April 12, 1960. With exchange of letters signed at Copenhagen May 11 and 18, 1960.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: August 22-28

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Releases issued prior to August 22 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 458 of August 13 and 467 of August 17.

No.	Date	Subject
477	8/22	Visit of King and Queen of Denmark (rewrite).
478	8/22	Herter: Foreign Ministers meeting, San José (printed in BULLETIN of September 5).
*479	8/22	Cultural exchange.
480	8/23	Supplementary document on Cuba.
481	8/23	Mutual weapons development program agreement with Australia.
*482	8/23	Dillon: House Foreign Affairs Committee.
483	8/23	Public access to historical documents.
484	8/24	Dillon: House Committee on Agriculture.
*485	8/24	Wadsworth and Barco nominated U.S. Representative and Deputy Representative to United Nations (biographic details).
486	8/24	Herter: Foreign Ministers meeting, San José.
487	8/25	Note to Czechoslovakia on Masaryk stamp.
†488	8/25	Dillon: Senate Foreign Relations Committee.
489	8/26	U.S. severs diplomatic relations with Dominican Republic.
490	8/26	FAO conference on fishery products.
*491	8/26	Whitman appointed Science Adviser (biographic details).
492	8/26	Hanes appointed U.S. chairman, Caribbean Commission (rewrite).
493	8/26	Herter: Foreign Ministers meeting, San José.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

American Republics. American Foreign Ministers Condemn Sino-Soviet Intervention in American States (Herter, text of declaration)	395
Australia. Weapons Development Agreement Concluded With Australia	427
Aviation	
Air Coordinating Committee Abolished (texts of Executive order and memorandum)	415
United States and Mexico Sign New Air Transport Agreement (text of agreement)	423
Congo, Republic of the. U.S. Supports U.N. Position in the Congo (Lodge)	421
Congress, The	
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	420
Funds Requested To Finance Export Expansion Program (Dillon)	418
President Asks for Discretion in Purchase of Dominican Sugar (Dillon, Eisenhower)	412
President Urges Congress To Restore Mutual Security Fund Cuts (Eisenhower)	417
Cuba	
American Foreign Ministers Condemn Sino-Soviet Intervention in American States (Herter, text of declaration)	395
U.S. Submits Supplement to Document on Cuba to OAS Ministerial Meeting (text of supplement)	409
Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia Queried on Bearing of Mail Bearing Masaryk Stamp (text of note)	414
Denmark. King and Queen of Denmark To Visit U.S. in October	414
Department and Foreign Service	
Appointments (Whitman)	429
Department Limits Use of Documents Prior to Official Publication	429
Designations (Walker)	429
Dominican Republic	
President Asks for Discretion in Purchase of Dominican Sugar (Dillon, Eisenhower)	412
United States Severs Relations With Dominican Republic	412
Economic Affairs	
Funds Requested To Finance Export Expansion Program (Dillon)	418
President Asks for Discretion in Purchase of Dominican Sugar (Dillon, Eisenhower)	412
U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement Terminated August 25 (text of proclamation, list of imports affected)	427
Hungary. U.S. Asks Inclusion of Item on Hungary in G.A. Agenda (Lodge)	422
International Organizations and Conferences	
American Foreign Ministers Condemn Sino-Soviet Intervention in American States (Herter, text of declaration)	395
FAO Conference on Fishery Products To Be Held in U.S. in 1961	422
President Appoints John W. Hanes, Jr., to Caribbean Commission	422
U.S. Submits Supplement to Document on Cuba to OAS Ministerial Meeting (text of supplement)	409
Iran. U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement Terminated August 25 (text of proclamation, list of imports affected)	427
Mexico. United States and Mexico Sign New Air Transport Agreement (text of agreement)	423
Military Affairs. Weapons Development Agreement Concluded With Australia	427
Mutual Security. President Urges Congress To Restore Mutual Security Fund Cuts (Eisenhower)	417
Presidential Documents	
Air Coordinating Committee Abolished	415
President Asks for Discretion in Purchase of Dominican Sugar	412
President Urges Congress To Restore Mutual Security Fund Cuts	417
U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement Terminated August 25	427
Publications	
Department Limits Use of Documents Prior to Official Publication	429
Recent Releases	430
Science. Whitman appointed Science Adviser	429
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	429
United States and Mexico Sign New Air Transport Agreement (text of agreement)	423
U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement Terminated August 25 (text of proclamation, list of imports affected)	427
Weapons Development Agreement Concluded With Australia	427
U.S.S.R. American Foreign Ministers Condemn Sino-Soviet Intervention in American States (Herter, text of declaration)	395
United Nations	
U.S. Asks Inclusion of Item on Hungary in G.A. Agenda (Lodge)	422
U.S. Supports U.N. Position in the Congo (Lodge)	421
Name Index	
Dillon, Douglas	413, 418
Eisenhower, President	412, 415, 417, 427
Hanes, John W., Jr.	422
Herter, Secretary	395
Lodge, Henry Cabot	421, 422
Walker, William W.	429
Whitman, Walter G.	429



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

FACT SHEET

Mutual Security in Action

The nature and objectives of the United States Mutual Security Program in various nations of the world are described in a series of country fact sheets published by the Department of State. Now available in the series are leaflets on the following countries:

	Publication Number		Publication Number
Afghanistan	6752	Korea	6975
Brazil	6951	Pakistan	6981
Cambodia	6931	Paraguay	6943
Ceylon	6936	The Philippines	6908
Chile	6969	Spain	6913
The Republic of China	6998	Thailand	7004
India	6988	Tunisia	6754
Israel	6985	Turkey	6898
Jordan	6897	Viet-Nam	6896

Copies of these fact sheets may be obtained for 10¢ each from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me copies of fact sheets for the following countries

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

E TO AVO
E, \$300